

EDINBURGH :
PRINTED BY T. CONSTABLE, PRINTER TO HER MAJESTY.

THE
NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

•

EDINBURGH :

PRINTED BY P. CONSTABLE, PRINTER TO HER MAJESTY.

THE
NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

NOVEMBER 1847 - FEBRUARY 1848.

VOL. VIII.

EDINBURGH :
W. P. KENNEDY, SOUTH ST. ANDREW STREET;
LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO. ;
DUBLIN: JAMES M'GLASHAN.

MDCCCXLVIII.

Uttarpore Jai Krishna Public Library
Acqn. No. 5451 Date 28-12-74

CONTENTS OF No. XVI.

ART.	PAGE
I. 1. Aus meinem Leben, Wahrheit und Dichtung. Goethe's Sämmtliche Werke. (Truth and Fiction, from my Life; Goethe's collected works.) Vols. xx. xxi. xxii. 1840.	
2. Freieisen (J. C.) Die beiden Friederiken in Sesenheim. (The two Friederikas in Sesenheim.) 1838.	
3. Näke (A. F.) Wallfahrt nach Sesenheim, herausgegeben von Varnhagen von Ense. (Pilgrimage to Sesenheim, Varnhagen von Ense.) 1840.	
4. Pudor, über Goethe's Iphigenie, ein Æsthetisch-literarischer Versuch. (On Goethe's Iphigenie, an Æsthetic-literary Essay.) 1842.	
5. F. Lewitz, über Goethe's Torquato Tasso. 1839.	
6. Döring's Leben Goethe's. (Life of Goethe.) 1840.	
7. Schiller, über Egmont. (Trauerspiel von Goethe.) Sämmtliche Werke. Bd. 12. 1838.	
8. Characteristics of Women. By Mrs. Jameson. 2 vols. 1846.	265
II. 1. The Angler's Companion to the Rivers and Lochs of Scotland. By Thomas Tod Stoddart. Edinburgh and London, 1847.	
2. A Handbook of Angling: teaching Fly-fishing, Trolling, Bottom-fishing, and Salmon-fishing. By Ephemera. London, 1847.	297
III. 1. The Worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary in the Church of Rome, &c. By J. Endell Tyler, B.D., Rector of St. Giles's in the Fields, and Canon Residentiary of St. Paul's. London: Printed for the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1846.	

ART.

PAGE

III.—*continued.*

2. Popery; its Character and Crimes. By W. Elfe Tayler. London, 1847.
3. Devotion to the Holy Virgin; or the Knowledge and Love of Mary. Translated from the French of Father de Gallifet, S. J., and dedicated to our Lady, Help of Christians. London, 1847.
4. The Rosary of the Blessed Virgin Mary. A Selection of Poetry, &c. By a Member of the Sodality of the Living Rosary.
5. The Glories of Mary, &c., with copious notes from the Works of St. Francis Liguori. Translated into English, and carefully revised, by a Catholic Priest. Fifth Edition. Dublin, 1845.
6. A Short Treatise on the Antiquity, Institution, Excellency, Indulgences, Privileges, &c., of the most famous and ancient Confraternity of our blessed Lady of Mount Carmel, commonly called the Scapular. Dublin, 1845.
7. Devout Prayers in honour of the Holy Name of Mary. "The heavens have announced the name of Mary, and all the people have seen the glory thereof." London. . 339

IV. Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Settlement and Poor Removal. May, 1847. 366

- V. 1. The White Cat. Illustrated by J. W. Edinburgh, 1848.
2. Fortunio. Illustrated by J. W. Edinburgh, 1848.
3. Our Street. By W. M. Thackeray. London, 1848. . 378

VI. Horae Biblicae Quotidianae. Daily Scripture Readings. By the late Thomas Chalmers, D.D., LL.D. Edited by the Rev. William Hanna, LL.D. Vols. I. II. Edinburgh, 1847-48. . 393

- VII. 1. Report by the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Colonization from Ireland, together with the minutes of evidence. Session 1847.
2. Emigration—Ireland—The Speech of Lord Montague on moving for a Committee in the House of Lords, June 4, 1847. From Hansard's Parliamentary Debates.
3. Ireland—its present Condition and future Prospects. By Robert Murray, Esq. Dublin, M^cGlashan. 1847.
4. A few Remarks and Suggestions on the present State of Ireland. By the Marquis of Sligo. 1847.
5. English Misrule and Irish Misdeeds. By Aubrey de Vere, Esq. 1848. . 421

ART.	PAGE
VIII. 1. A Bill to provide for the Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages in Scotland. 1847.	.
2. A Bill to amend the Law of Scotland affecting the Constitution of Marriage. 1847.	.
3. Speech of the Lord Advocate on the Marriage and Registration (Scotland) Bills. 1847.	465
IX. Results of Astronomical Observations made during the years 1834, 5, 6, 7, 8, at the Cape of Good Hope, being the completion of a Telescopic Survey of the whole surface of the visible heavens, commenced in 1825. By Sir John Herschel, Bart., K.H., D.C.L., F.R.S. London and Edinburgh.	491
X. 1. Statements and Reflections. By Archbishop Whately.	
2. A Concise History of the Hampden Controversy, &c. &c. By the Rev. Henry Christmas, M.A., F.R.S., F.S.A. London, 1848.	
3. A Letter to the Very Reverend the Dean of Chichester, on the agitation excited by the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford. By Julius Charles Hare, M.A., Archdeacon of Lewes. London, 1848.	534



THE

NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

FEBRUARY, 1848.

- ART. I.—1. *Aus meinem Leben, Wahrheit und Dichtung.* GOETHE'S *Sämmtliche Werke.* (*Truth and Fiction, from my Life; GOETHE'S collected Works.*) Vols. xx. xxi. xxii. 1840.
2. FREIHEISEN (J. C.) *Die beiden Friederiken in Sesenheim.* (*The Two Friederikas in Sesenheim.*) 1838.
3. NÄKE (A. F.) *Wallfahrt nach Sesenheim, herausgegeben von VARNHAGEN VON ENSE.* (*Pilgrimage to Sesenheim, VARNHAGEN v. ENSE.*) 1840.
4. PUDOR, über GOETHE'S *Iphigenie*, ein *Ästhetisch-literarischer Versuch.* (*On GOETHE'S Iphigenie, an Æsthetic-literary Essay.*) 1842.
5. F. LEWITZ, über GOETHE'S *Torquato Tasso.* 1839.
6. DORING'S *Leben Goethe's.* (*Life of Goethe.*) 1840.
7. Schiller, über *Egmont.* (*Trauerspiel von GOETHE.*) *Sämmtliche Werke.* Bd. 12. 1838.
8. *Characteristics of Women.* By Mrs. JAMIESON. 2 vols. 1846.

CARLYLE said, in his *Hero Worship*, that the appreciation of Goethe in this country must be left to future times; and when he made the remark, there seemed reason enough for it. We well remember, ten or fifteen years ago, the difficulty with which Goethe's very name was pronounced by Englishmen. What was to become of the *h* in the middle, or the *e* at the end, no one could tell; and the diphthong was an obstacle as insurmountable as the Pentagramma on the threshold of Faust's study. All this, however, has been changed within the last few years, and there is not now a boarding-school girl of fifteen, to whom the name of the great German bard is not as familiar as that of her own music-master. Whether much real progress has been made in pene-

trating the deeper nature of the profoundest of poets, is a question which we shall not attempt here to answer. In many respects it may be that he still continues, to the majority of our reading public, as great a mystery as he was before; and there are not a few points of view in which he is, and, we believe, will continue to be, a mystery to the Germans themselves. But although we may be disposed to dismiss a portion of Goethe's writings as incomprehensible for the present, and to regard other parts of them as not without the need of those commentaries which they have so largely received at the hands of his countrymen, both in the shape of lectures and of books,* we should do little justice to the many-sidedness which so remarkably characterizes him if we forgot that, whilst he is the deepest and the most abstruse, he is also the most popular of all modern poets. He has a language for the many as well as for the few; and the avenues which lead to the temple in which he has preserved the hidden treasures of his genius, are strewn with the fairest and the tenderest flowers. Whilst we are marvelling at the almost prophetic sagacity with which he enters into the feelings of a learned misanthrope, in whose eyes knowledge has become worthless from its very familiarity, we are, by a gradual and insensible transition, led to weep over the sorrows of a village maiden who has stumbled on the very threshold of life and enjoyment. In one page we have matter which may give pause to the most thoughtful,—the next transports us from the region of intelligence into the very innermost recesses of the natural heart. It would be no easy task to determine with which of these two departments of our nature Goethe was most thoroughly conversant. In the general case we find that men who have cultivated to a very great extent their intellectual faculties, either in order that they may apply them to some department of learning or science, or that, as metaphysicians, they may make them the subject of their own contemplations, have done so to the almost entire exclusion of their affections and their passions. They are, for the most part, amiable, and even kind-hearted; for this simple reason, that, giving themselves little trouble about the love or the hatred of others, and their evil propensities being curbed by

* We give the following as a specimen of the industry with which the Germans

heit dargestellt, 1836; *Enk*, Briefe über Goethe's Faust, 1837; *Falk*, Goethe im persönlichen Umgange; *Lucas* (Dr.) Ueber den dichterischen Plan von Goethe's Faust; *Rauch*, Vorlesungen über Goethe's Faust, 1832; *Schönborn* (Dr. G.) Zur Verständigung über Goethe's Faust, 1838; *Schubarth*, Vorlesungen über Goethe's Faust, 1830; *Weisse* (C. H.) Kritik und Erläuterungen des Faust, 1837; *Rotzcher*, Der Zweite Theil des Goethischen Faust, 1840.

their continual occupations, the kindlier feelings which preponderate in most natures are left to a free and unconscious exercise. They seldom mingle at all in the affairs of life, because they take little interest in them either one way or another; and if they do so, it is generally on the side of friendship, because it is less troublesome, on the whole, to do a kindness than an injury—the latter can always be omitted with advantage, and the “laissez aller” is their rule in such matters, to which they do not willingly make an exception. Poets and romancers, on the other hand, and all that class of men whose aim is happiness rather than knowledge, are usually, almost entirely, the creatures of impulse—their converse is with the affairs of the heart—they are dragged hither and thither by their passions—they cannot live without sympathy—and even hatred is less intolerable than indifference. As examples of this class, Rousseau and Byron at once suggest themselves. Under neither of these categories can Goethe be ranked, for, in truth, he belonged almost equally to both. With the single exception of his profession, which was the Law, there was, we believe, no department of mental exertion, even the most unpoetical, in which he had not laboured vigorously during some period or other of his long life.

In these multifarious occupations he engaged, not as the impulse of the moment might direct, but as he considered most suitable for the preservation of his mental equanimity. Thus, on the occasion of Schiller's death, he shut himself up in his house, and for days applied himself to scientific research. Even his works of imagination were engaged in, less with a view to the gratification than to the government of his passions. *Werther's Leiden*, it is well known, were written for the purpose—and had the effect—of forcing the mind of the author from that morbid sentimentality so characteristic of many of his countrymen. In his *Wahrheit und Dichtung*, he mentions, that so early as during his residence in Leipsic, he formed the habit of turning whatever exalted or depressed him, or otherwise much affected him, into a picture or a poem, in order, he says, as it were to balance accounts with his own mind—to set himself to rights with the external world. His aversion to violent emotions he is said to have inherited from his mother; but, whencesoever it came, the mode which he adopted to preserve the mastery over his feelings, whilst it proved their strength, shows, at the same time, how little he was disposed to be their slave. His whole life, indeed, seems to have been a series of mental observations and psychological experiments; and his own emotions he regarded only as the means of enabling him to become more intimately acquainted with what he wished to study, and to portray. His true position was that of an observer; and the duties belonging to it he was equally

ready to exercise upon himself and upon others. Had the emotional part of his nature been less powerful than it was, the range of his observation would have been narrowed; had it been less under subjection, the power of observing would have been lost. As it was, he had the faculty of immediately converting the subjective into the objective: and the marvellous truth of the latter is no doubt in a great measure to be attributed to the intensity of the former. In him we have the singular, and, we believe, unparalleled phenomenon, of the enthusiastic temperament of a poet united with the faculties of a cool and dispassionate observer. It is no doubt difficult to conceive the union of elements usually so antagonistic; and to those who are partially acquainted with the works of Goethe, but who have devoted little attention to the study of his most singular character, it will seem incredible that beings so perfectly natural, often so childlike in their simplicity, as the imaginary characters whom we everywhere meet in his pages, should be the creations of an observer. The difficulty lies in continually bearing in mind, that whilst he observed he also sympathized. If he had been a mere vulgar observer,—one, that is, who is continually on the watch for phenomena, he would, like most men of that character, have made few discoveries, for the very simple reason, that he would have had little to observe; while, on the other hand, if he had been a man of emotion and passion merely, his characters, like those of Byron, would have been coloured by the medium of his own imagination, through which, and through which alone, he would have seen them. But, uniting in himself the apparently incompatible elements of the one character and of the other, the seeming paradox was explained, and what he felt intensely, he saw and painted in the light of nature alone. We may picture to ourselves Goethe the philosopher, sitting serene upon a rock, looking quietly down upon the troubled sea which agitated the heart of Goethe the man.

It is to this double nature, if we may so speak, and to the unwearied perseverance with which he availed himself of the advantages which it gave him, that we have to ascribe the wonderful truth of Goethe's imaginary characters. From the minute knowledge which he had acquired of the workings of his own mind in every possible condition, from indifference up to the most violent emotion, and from the intense sympathy which opened to him the minds of others, and enabled him to reproduce their feelings within himself, he could enter so thoroughly into an imaginary character, as to say with something little short of certainty, what his or her mental state in any given circumstances would be. In working out a tragedy, therefore, he drew less upon his fancy than upon his positive knowledge; the data being given or

assumed, he possessed within his own mind the means of arriving at a certain and infallible result; and thus it is, that in perusing his works, we feel not as if he were giving us the fruits of his imagination, but as if he were relating to us what had positively been. He does not create to us beings who might have existed had man been differently organized, or more highly endowed; but he places beings, such as do exist, in imaginary circumstances, and then he lays open before us the whole workings of their hearts. We are astonished, not at meeting with new and unknown natures, but at seeing the whole instead of the half of that nature with which we are already familiar.

From these observations it will be seen, that we are disposed to regard Goethe in the light of what may be called a poetic realist. His first endeavour seems ever to have been to obtain the most intimate possible union with the person who for the time had awakened his enthusiasm—to enter into his very nature, and to live his life. When thus saturated as it were with the feelings of a real character, his marvellous objectivity came immediately to his aid, and the imaginary being rose like an exhalation from his own mind. This we shall scarcely illustrate better, than by tracing the origin of a few of the most celebrated of his female characters.

From the perfect candour with which Goethe has laid before us the history of his early loves, we are enabled not only to discover how it was that he contrived to become so thoroughly acquainted with every shade of womanly feeling in general, but also to trace, for the most part, the sources from which his individual characters were derived. In some cases he has given us direct information on this point—in others he has left the resemblance to be traced by the ingenuity of his readers.

In poets and in painters, and perhaps in men who are neither the one nor the other, it is tolerably certain that the object of their first sincere attachment furnishes not a few of the elements which go to make up the character which continues through life, for them, to be most attractive. Their ideal woman, however exalted and refined by their own farther development, will continue to bear a sisterly resemblance to their first love. Who can fail to recognise, even in the most spiritual of Raphael's later creations, the fair-haired Madonnas of his earliest time. We may conceive the Madonna di San Sisto, as representing the glorified body of the "bella Giardiniera." A more minute acquaintance with the early days of the prince of painters, would probably reveal to us the simple story of some yellow-haired daughter of Urbino, whom he had wooed on the breezy heights of the Apennines, while yet he listened to the instruc-

tions and sat at the feet of old Pietro Perugino, and whose recompense for many an hour of youthful bliss has been, that her image has been consecrated by the hands of her lover, and for ever entwined with the highest conceptions which men in after times were to form of sacred beauty. In the other great painters, it seems to us that we can trace something analogous,—the delicately sensual air which characterizes the whole of Corregio's women—the sunny glow of wanton life and joy which warms those of Titian—and the mild and saint-like spirit which is shed over Murillo's virgins, seem to mark them out as three distinct families of beautiful sisters, in each of whom we can trace the resemblance to some common parent. They have each, in short, what is called a *type*, the origin of which may be that which we have suggested.

In the little story of Goethe's childish passion for the Frankfort Gretchen, and the description which he has given of her person and character, one can detect many of the features which peculiarly distinguish his females. It is pretty certain that she was the mother of the Gretchen in Faust in more than the name; and as the prototype of this—at once the simplest and most celebrated of the sisterhood—it will probably not be out of place if we should introduce her to such of our readers as may not already have made her acquaintance. Whilst still a school-boy at Frankfort, and living in his father's house, Goethe informs us that he accidentally made the acquaintance of several boys of a lower rank of life than that to which he belonged. His chief reason for frequenting their society seems to have been the passion which, even at this early age, he possessed, for making himself acquainted with the habits and feelings of men in all the positions of life; and the tie which bound them to him, besides the pride of associating with a person above their rank, was his poetical talent, which even then had begun to show itself, and which enabled him to come to the aid of their more tardy invention, in the manner in which another great poet is said to have done to that of a great king. He was the means of enabling them to carry on a small mystification, by supplying them with verses which they sent to the sweetheart of one of their number; and his ready wit also contributed the responses to his own effusions. In pursuance of this little piece of boyish wickedness, his friends had invited him, on one occasion, to take part in a small supper party in a tavern, and here it was that he encountered the object of his first attachment in the humble capacity of the bar-maid. We should probably injure the beautifully *naïve* description which he has given us of the whole scene more by a paraphrase, than even by an imperfect translation; and we shall therefore endeavour to present it to

our readers as nearly as possible with its original colouring. Speaking of the trick which they were engaged in playing off on their companion, he says,—

“My natural good-heartedness left me little pleasure in such a wicked deception, and the repetition of the same theme began already to disgust me. I should certainly have spent a tiresome evening, if an unexpected apparition had not brought me suddenly to life. When we came, we found the table already covered—tidy and nice, and supplied with a passable quantity of wine. We took our seats, and remained alone, there being no need for service. At last, however, as the wine ran short, one of the party called for the servant, but instead of her, there came a girl of uncommon, and indeed, when one considered her position, of incredible beauty. ‘What do you want?’ she said, after she had greeted us with a friendly good evening; ‘the girl is ill, and has gone to bed. Can I serve you?’—‘We want wine,’ said one of them; ‘will you go and get us a couple of bottles, like a good girl?’—‘Do it, Gretchen,’ said another; ‘it’s only a kitten’s jump over the way.’—‘Why not?’ said the girl, and taking a couple of empty bottles from the table, she ran out of the room. Her figure, seen from behind, was even more fascinating. The little cap sat so neatly on her pretty little head, which a slender neck united in the most charming way with her delicate shoulders. Everything about her seemed perfection; and now that the attention was no longer attracted and fettered by the sincere quiet eye and the sweet mouth, one could follow at leisure the effect of her whole figure. I reproached my companions for sending the pretty child out alone into the night, but they only laughed at me, and I was speedily consoled by her reappearance, for the tapster’s was only on the other side of the street. ‘Now, in return, you must come and join us,’ said one of them to the girl. She did so; but alas! she did not sit beside me. When she had drank a glass to our healths, she left us with the advice that we should not remain very long, and above all not to get *loud*, as the old mother was just going to bed. It was not her mother, but the mother of our landlady.”

We have here a picture worthy of an artist’s pencil. The little old Frankfort *Schenke*, with its smoky walls and its oaken rafters, the boys around the table, and the beautiful features of the youthful Goethe, beaming with the glow of a first emotion, as he gazed in astonishment upon their lovely attendant, form an *ensemble*, which seems to want nothing but the touch of genius to transfer it from the page to the canvass, and to convert it into the most charming cabinet-picture:—

“The image of this maiden,” he says, “followed me, sleeping and waking, wherever I went. It was the first permanent impression which a female nature had made upon me; and since I neither could find, nor was willing to seek, a pretence for seeing her again in the house, I went to church for her sake, and was not long in discovering

where she sat, and thus I had abundant opportunity, during the long Protestant service, of gazing at her till I was satisfied. When the congregation dispersed, I had not courage to speak to her, far less to accompany her home, but was transported with joy when, by a little nod of her head, she seemed to return my greeting."

His hopes of a second meeting, however, were destined to be gratified at no distant period. His friends were pressing him for an answer to the love-epistle, and as the recompense, he knew, would be another sight of Gretchen, it may be supposed that he did not idle over his task.

"I set to work immediately," he says, "and thought of every thing that would be most agreeable to me, if Gretchen were to write it. I thought that I had succeeded so thoroughly, in writing every part of it as if it had proceeded out of her person, her nature, her manner, and her mind, that I could not restrain the wish that it might really be so; and I lost myself in rapture at the very thought that something of the kind might really be addressed by her to me. In this way I succeeded in mystifying myself, whilst I was engaged in making another ridiculous, and it was destined that I should yet be rewarded for my pains, with many a joy, and many a sorrow. When I was again called on for the piece, I was ready, and promised, and did not fail to come at the appointed hour. Only one of the youths had arrived; Gretchen was sitting at the window spinning, and the old mother was going about through the house. The young man requested that I would read my production aloud. I did so, and not without emotion, while I peeped over the paper from time to time at the beautiful child; and when I imagined that I perceived a certain restlessness in her manner, and a slight blush on her cheek, I read in a clearer and more lively manner the parts which expressed what I wished that she had addressed to me. My friend, who had often interrupted me with his commendations, at last requested that I would make some slight alterations. They had chiefly reference to those parts which indeed suited better for Gretchen's condition than for that of the girl from whom they were supposed to come, who was of a good family, wealthy, well known, and respected in the town. When the young man had pointed out to me the passages which he wished to have altered, and had brought me writing materials, he took his leave of us for a short time, in consequence of an engagement, and I remained sitting at a bench against the wall, behind the large table, trying my alterations upon the large slate, which usually lay in the window for writing the reckonings upon, and on which also those who came and went used to inform each other of their motions. I had been labouring for some time in vain, writing and rubbing out again, when at last, losing patience, I called out, it won't do any way! 'So much the better,' said Gretchen, firmly, 'I should be very well pleased if it didn't do at all; you ought to have nothing to do with such tricks.' She rose from her wheel, and coming to the table beside me, she read me a lecture with great good sense

and good feeling. 'The thing seems an innocent jest,' she said; 'it is a jest, but not an innocent one. I can remember more than one occasion where our young people came into a great deal of trouble in consequence of such a piece of mischief.'—'But what shall I do?' I replied; 'the letter is written, and they trust to my altering it.'—'Believe me,' she said, 'and don't alter it at all; indeed, the better way is, that you take it back, put it into your pocket, and go away and try to put the affair to rights through the intervention of your friend. I will also say a little word on the occasion; for look you, though I am a poor girl, dependent upon these people, who are my relations, and who, though they don't, it is true, do any thing that is positively bad, still often, for fun and for profit, play many a desperate trick: I stood out against them with the last letter, and would not copy it as they wished; they copied it themselves in a feigned hand, and they may do the like by this one, if the thing cannot be otherwise. But you, a young man of good family, wealthy, and independent, why should you allow yourself to be made the instrument for carrying out such an affair, out of which nothing that is good, and perhaps much that is disagreeable for you, may arise?' I was beyond measure happy to hear her thus speak continuously, for hitherto she had only put in a word in the conversation from time to time. My interest increased inconceivably. I was no longer master of myself, and replied, 'I am not so independent as you think, and what does it help me to be rich, so long as that for which I most wish is denied me.'

"She had taken the draft of my poetical epistle into her hand, and read it, half aloud, very sweetly and pleasantly. 'It is exceedingly pretty,' she said, whilst with a sort of *naïve* pointedness she held her breath for a moment, and then added, 'it is only a pity that it is not intended for any real use.' 'That were indeed much to be wished,' I exclaimed; 'how happy must he be who should receive from a girl whom he really loved such an assurance of her affection.' 'It would require a great deal to bring that about,' she said, 'and yet many things are possible.' 'For example,' I continued, 'if any one who knows you, esteems you, honours you, and worships you, were to lay such a sheet before you, and prayed you most importunately, most heartily, and most kindly, what would you do?' I pushed the paper over to her which she had returned. She smiled—reflected for a moment—took the pen and wrote her name under it. I could not contain myself for joy. I sprang from my seat, and was going to take her in my arms. 'No kissing,' she said, 'that is something so vulgar, but loving, if it be possible.' I took the paper, and put it carefully past. 'No one shall have it,' I said, 'and the thing is at an end. You have saved me!' 'Now finish what I have begun,' she exclaimed, 'and run as fast as you can, before the others come and bring you again into trouble and embarrassment.' I could not turn myself away from her; but she entreated me in the kindest manner, and taking my right hand into both of hers, she pressed it most lovingly. I was not far from tears. I thought I saw her eyes moist. I pressed my face on her hands, and ran away. In my whole life I had never been in such a state of distraction."

He frequently refers afterwards, in the same pleasing and natural way, to this boyish attachment, which subsisted till shortly before his departure for the university, when it came to rather a disagreeable termination, by his male companions getting involved in a serious scrape, which brought their doings under the notice of the authorities, and exposed the whole of his connexion with them. His family, as may be supposed, when the matter came to light, took effectual steps to put an end to his farther intercourse with Gretchen. She was removed from Frankfort, and he never saw her again; but he tells us, that what wounded his feelings most of all was, that when the girl was examined about the relation which subsisted between them, she called him "a child."—"I," he says, "who regarded myself as a very knowing and adroit young man."

She seems, indeed, to have been a sensible and very superior girl, and to have regarded him all along in no other light than that of a love-sick boy, whose precocious talents, and handsome person, rendered him a very agreeable and interesting playfellow. We know not whether the identity of name, and the similarity of position, have had any influence in inducing us to think, that there is so strong a resemblance between this girl and the Gretchen in *Faust*, as to warrant the conclusion that the one is the original of the other. In both, we find the same sound, natural, simple sense, and deep, true feeling. They seem both to be the happiest of nature's productions, unaided and uncontaminated by one single tinge of art. These children of nature, indeed, seem all along to have been the women whom Goethe most loved, holding, as he did, (what, with regard to females, at all events, we believe to be the orthodox doctrine,) that all training which has another effect than that of bringing out their natural qualities is prejudicial, and believing that the ordinary occurrences of life (what Byron calls—

"That useful sort of knowledge

Which is acquired in nature's good old college,")

will, in most cases, accomplish this purely feminine development quite as well as the most laboured education.

It would be altogether out of place to offer any analysis of a character so well known even to purely English readers as the Margaret in *Faust*. The natural buoyancy of her innocent heart, when she is first presented to us, at once secures our affections and our sympathies. She is the "May Queen" of Tennyson, with something more of thought and character; and the deep pathos of the latter scenes in which she mourns over her fall, is unequalled by anything which we have ever seen in any language. Her prayer to the Virgin, above all, is so perfectly heart-rending in its deep and tender grief, that we believe very few who understand it in

the original, and are capable of feeling at all, would undertake to read it aloud with dry eyes.* It is not unworthy of remark, as illustrative of the perfect artlessness with which Goethe has succeeded in investing this marvellous creation, that although every actress of note in Germany, since its first publication till the present day, has attempted to personate it, not one has succeeded in so far laying aside all appearance of art, as to do so to the satisfaction of the public. Mephistopheles has been acted to perfection, and some have even been tolerably successful with Faust ; but although Margaret appears on the stage, in all, only some five or six times, and although all that she utters, including her two little songs, might be spoken with ease in eight or ten minutes, yet the reproduction of her character in an animated form is a

* We make no apology for the following translation of this celebrated scene, notwithstanding that some sixty or seventy versions of it have been published. As they are all confessedly faulty, we can scarcely be blamed for making one effort more in behalf of the English reader. If we fail, we shall do so in company with many, with whom we shall not feel ashamed to be classed.

A narrow chamber.—An image of the “Mater dolorosa” in a niche in the wall, with a vase for flowers before it.

GRETCHEN.

(Puts fresh flowers into the vase.)

“Thy head in pity bend,
 Mother of sorrows, lend
 Ear to my wo,
 The sword within thy heart who feelest,
 As in anguish now thou kneelest,
 The cross below.
 Now to God thy sighs ascending,
 Comforts now from him descending
 Succour thy wo.
 Who feels,
 What anguish steals,
 To me through flesh and bone ;
 What my feeble tongue would mutter,
 How my poor heart now doth flutter,
 Thou canst know, and thou alone.
 To thee I ever go,
 Wo ! wo ! wo ! wo !
 My heart is rent in twain.
 When I would my matins keep,
 I must weep, and weep, and weep ;
 My head will burst with pain.
 My tears upon the window-sill
 Fell down like morning dew,
 As from the eglantine I plucked
 These fresh-blown flowers for you.
 Full bright within my little room,
 The morning sun did shine,
 Whilst I, bewailing still my doom,
 Upon my bed did pine.
 Oh ! mother, save from shame and wo
 To thee I ever, ever go ;
 Oh ! hear thy handmaid low.”

difficulty, which as yet has been found insurmountable. From the general character of Jenny Lind's acting and singing, we should think that it would lie nearer to her, than to any of those who have hitherto attempted it.

In pursuing the course of Goethe's early attachments—at least of such as exerted an influence on his literary labours and his after life—the next personage who presents herself is the Friederike of Sesenheim, the original, as he tells us, of the two Marys—the one in *Götz von Berlichingen*, and the other in *Clariço*. But before proceeding to this, the most notable and the most interesting of his youthful passions, as also that in which he was most to blame, we shall present our readers, by way of episode, with the amusing anecdote of the two pretty daughters of the Strasbourg dancing-master.

Goethe's father, who had retired from the active duties of his profession with a considerable fortune and a high-sounding title, and who seems to have been a strange, eccentric, and in many respects childish old man, took upon his own shoulders the whole duty of superintending the early education of his son. In this avocation his zeal knew no bounds, and the most trifling accomplishments, and the most needful acquirements, were equally important in his eyes, provided only that they had reference to Wolfgang. Even dancing was not beneath his notice; and Goethe has given us an amusing description of the manner in which he used to play on an old *flûte-douce*, whilst he taught his sister and him to stand in position and square their toes, and himself inculcated his precepts by his example. The instructions of the old "Königlicher Rath," however, seem to have infused into the mind of his son, no very passionate fondness for the fantastic art; and during the whole of his residence in Leipsic, he informs us that he never once attempted to avail himself of them, except when forced to do so by dire necessity.

On his arrival in Strasbourg, however, he soon discovered that the want of this accomplishment, which he had succeeded in despising in the north, very considerably interfered with his enjoyment of the light-hearted life which prevailed in the sunny Alsace, and he therefore determined forthwith to supply the deficiency by putting himself into the hands of a regular professor. This personage, he informs us, was a stiff old Frenchman, whose instructions would probably have proved little more amusing than those which Goethe had formerly received, had he not had the good fortune to be the father of two pretty daughters. So soon as the old gentleman had laid a firm foundation in the rudiments of the art, these fair assistants were called in to his aid, and the advancement of the pupil was thus most effectually secured.

"Instructed in the art from their youth, they were exceedingly

dexterous, and by their aid even the most awkward scholars must soon have attained a certain proficiency. They were both very polite—spoke nothing but French, and I, on my side, did my best in order not to appear awkward and absurd in their eyes. I was fortunate enough to gain their good opinion, and they were always willing to dance a minuet to their father's little fiddle, and what, indeed, was a more difficult matter, even to drag me round and round in the waltz. Their father seemed to have no great number of scholars, and they probably led rather a tiresome and solitary life. On this account they used often to ask me after my lesson was over to remain with them and help them to chatter away the time for a little; and this I was nowise loath to do, particularly as the younger one pleased me exceedingly, and they both behaved themselves in a very becoming way. I used sometimes to read them a piece of a romance, and they in their turn did the like. The elder one, who was quite as pretty—perhaps prettier than her sister, but for whom I had not by any means the same liking, behaved always more kindly, and was in every way more obliging than the other. When I got my lesson she was always at hand, and often she was the means of prolonging the hour, in consequence of which I frequently considered it my duty to offer her father two tickets, which he, however, never would accept. The younger one, on the other hand, though she was not unfriendly, kept herself out of the way, and always waited till her father called her to relieve her sister."

The reason of this conduct he soon discovered to be that the younger one was engaged to be married, whilst the heart of the elder, as she herself informed him, was free. An old fortune-teller having made her appearance one evening, the girls engaged her to tell their fortunes. The result for the younger one was all that could be wished; but when the fate of the elder one came to be decided, the response of the oracle was, that "she loved, that she was not beloved in return, and that another person stood between her and the object of her affections." This she immediately applied to her own and her sister's relation to Goethe, and a violent scene immediately ensued, which terminated in her going to bed in a pet, and in his rushing out of the house.

"The next day," he says, "I did not venture to return, but the day after, Emilie (the younger one) sent me word by a boy who had already brought me many a message from the sisters, and carried to them flowers and fruit in return, that I must positively come. I went at the usual hour, and found the father alone; who had many improvements to suggest in my gait, and carriage, and walking, and dancing, but on the whole seemed tolerably well satisfied with me. Towards the end of the lesson the younger sister came in and danced a most graceful minuet with me, in which she showed herself off to the greatest advantage, and the father assured us that he had not often seen a handsomer or more expert pair upon his boards. When

the hour was ended, I went as usual to the sitting-room, and the father left us, but Lucinde was not to be seen. 'She is lying in bed,' said Emilie, 'and I am very well pleased to see it; don't you give yourself any concern about the matter. Her mental ailments always get better soonest when she takes it into her head that she is ill; for as she is not very anxious to die, she does anything then that we choose to ask her. We have some home-made medicines which she takes on such occasions, and the raging waves are laid by degrees. She is exceedingly gentle and lovable when she suffers from such an imaginary disease, and seeing that she feels very well in reality, and is suffering from nothing but passion, she imagines to herself all sorts of romantic deaths, with which she frightens herself in a pleasant sort of way, pretty much as children do with ghosts. Last night she assured me, in the most passionate manner, that this time she certainly should die, and told me that I was not to bring the false and ungrateful friend to her bed-side till she was quite near her end, when she was to reproach him in the bitterest manner, and then give up the ghost.' I told Emilie that I could not charge myself with ever having expressed any affection for her sister, and added, that I knew of one who could very well bear witness to the fact. Emilie smiled and replied, I understand you perfectly, and if we don't behave prudently and firmly, we may all of us get into a bad scrape. What would you say if I were to ask you to give up your lessons?"

She then explained to him that on the former evening, after his departure, the fortune-teller had thrown the cards for him, and that a person, whom she took to be herself, had been ever by his side, between him and her sister. She also informed him of her engagement, and of a growing affection which she nevertheless felt for him, and showed him what a disagreeable position he would find himself in between two sisters; one of whom he had made unhappy by his affection, and the other by his coldness. The argument seemed unanswerable. Goethe consented to depart; but his farewell to the younger sister was suddenly interrupted by the entrance of the elder, who, rushing into the room, exclaimed, "You shall not be the only one who takes leave of him!"

"I tried to take hold of her hand and say something friendly to her, but she turned herself away, and walked with great strides two or three times through the room, and then threw herself down in the corner of the sofa. Emilie approached her, but she beckoned her away, and then there was a scene which it is painful for me even now to recollect, and which, though there was in reality nothing theatrical about it, but, on the contrary, it was extremely suitable to the nature of a passionate young Frenchwoman, would still require an actress of no common merit to reproduce it worthily on the stage.

"Lucinde overwhelmed her sister with a thousand reproaches. 'His is not the first heart,' she said, 'which was inclining towards me, of which you have robbed me. Was it not the same with your ab-

sent lover, who at last betrothed himself with you under my very eyes. I was forced to look on and see it quietly. I supported it; but I know how many thousand tears it has cost me. And now you must take this one from me also, and that without letting the other go. How many do you intend to have at a time? I am open and good-natured, and therefore every one thinks that he can know me in a moment, and on that account is entitled to neglect me; you are shy and quiet, and people think that something very wonderful must lie hidden within you. But there is nothing within you but a cold, selfish heart, which can offer everything up to its own gratification. This, however, no one discovers, because it lies deeply hidden in your bosom, and is as little recognised as my warm true heart, which I display as openly as my face.'

"Emilie was silent, and seated herself beside her sister, who became more and more violent in her language, and even expatiated upon subjects with which it was not at all necessary I should be acquainted. Emilie, on the contrary, who tried all she could to pacify her, made me a sign from behind that I should make my escape; but as jealousy and suspicion see with a thousand eyes, Lucinde remarked it in a moment. She sprung up and advanced towards me, but not violently. She stood before me, and seemed to reflect, then she said, 'I know that I have lost you; I make no further claim on your affection. But neither shall you have him, sister!' With these words she laid hold of me by the head, fastened both her hands in my hair, and kissed me again and again on the mouth. 'Now,' she said, 'beware of my curse. Whoever shall kiss these lips for the first time after me, may misfortune upon misfortune follow her for ever and ever! Now, tamper with him again, if you dare: Heaven, I know, will hear me this time! And you, sir—run, run as fast as you can.'

"I rushed down the stair with the firm determination never more to enter the house."

We may search long before we find a more perfect specimen of the thorough French "scène" than that with which this little anecdote presents us. It is interesting too, as showing the wonderful attraction which Goethe must have had for women at this period of his life,—an advantage indeed, which, like most of those which he possessed, he retained even in old age—as witness the passion of the enthusiastic Bettina. Judging indeed by the number of his conquests, and the sincerity which appears to have characterized them on the side of the ladies, he might well have shared with Louis XV. the enviable title of "le bien-aimé." That such should have been the case in his youth, at all events, is not surprising. If, to his great personal beauty, (of which the testimony of his friends, and the portrait which remains of him, leave no doubt,) we add, easy and affable manners, which enabled him, in conversation, at all times to avail himself of his transcendent talents—good birth—and, for his country at all events, very considerable wealth,

we have altogether an aggregation of charms, to which the hearts of few women were likely to remain indifferent. We shall presently have to deplore that his conduct was not always worthy of the advantages which he thus possessed, and that he was too often forgetful of the duties of self-government and self-denial, which in a well regulated mind ought ever to be associated with the consciousness of power.

During his residence at Strasbourg, Goethe made the acquaintance of Herder, and spent much time in his society, particularly during a long and painful illness, when he seems to have been his almost constant attendant. Herder was five years Goethe's senior, and possessed as he was of inexhaustible information upon almost every conceivable subject, and of the purest and most discerning taste, his converse seems to have exerted a very powerful influence upon the mental development of his youthful friend. Amongst other hitherto-unexplored regions into which he was the means of guiding him, one was the literature of England, then just beginning to exert an influence upon the progression party of the literati of Germany. Goethe's English reading, like that of most foreigners, began with the *Vicar of Wakefield*—a book indeed, which, on the continent, seems now to be set apart as the acknowledged stepping-stone to English; and the bare mention of which will, we doubt not, recall to some of our readers scenes of mutual instruction, not very dissimilar to that which Byron describes as taking place between Juan and Haidée—

“Where both the teacher and the taught were young.”

Goethe has pronounced an eloquent eulogium upon this happy little romance, which seems to have continued a favourite with him to the end of his days—its charms being probably not a little enhanced by its association with the scenes to which we are presently to introduce our readers.

Herder, he tells us, regarded it with the eyes of a critic, whilst he “*felt* it as a man—or rather as a youth, to whom all was living, true, and present.” In order, however, still farther to realize the scenes with which in description he had been so much delighted, Goethe procured, through one of his fellow-students, an introduction to the family of the pastor of Sessenheim, a little village in Alsace, about six German miles from Strasbourg. The circumstances and whole position of this worthy Vicar, for such in his own country he was, seem wonderfully to have resembled those of him of *Wakefield*; and Goethe tells us that the attractions which his house was represented to him as holding out, beyond boundless hospitality, were a sensible wife and two very interesting daughters. On the occasion of his first visit, Goethe dressed himself in a sort of disguise, in order to see.

what effect his presence would produce when personating the character of a poor student of Theology. This, and the shame which he afterwards felt at playing so awkward a part in the presence of the young ladies, and which induced him to borrow the clothes of the son of an innkeeper in the village, gave rise to some curious adventures, with which, though droll enough in themselves, we shall not at present trouble our readers. The description of the scene of these exploits, however, as indicative of the character of the inhabitants, is not unimportant. "The house," he says, "had about it exactly that which we call picturesque, and which always so much charmed me in Dutch pictures. The influence which time exercises on all the works of man was here very apparent. The house, and sheds, and stables, had all of them arrived exactly at that point in the process of decay, at which one wavers between repairing and building anew, and omits the one without adopting the other." The former, however, was the desire of its possessor—a somewhat weak old man, into whose good graces Goethe very soon succeeded in insinuating himself, by furnishing him with innumerable suggestions for the accomplishment of this, his favourite project. During their first conversation on this fruitful subject, Goethe's friend had gone in search of the other members of the family. At last he returned, accompanied by the mother, whom Goethe describes as a very different person from her husband.

"Her features were regular, with an expression of great good sense. In her youth she must have been extremely good-looking. Her figure was tall and thin, but not more so than was suitable for her years, and when seen from behind she had still quite a youthful air. The eldest daughter came springing into the room after her, and asked after Friederike, as the two others had already done. Her father assured them that he had not seen her since they all three had gone out together. The daughter went to the door again to seek for her sister; the mother brought us some refreshments; and Weyland (Goethe's friend) entered into a conversation with the spouses, with reference to the circumstances of their common acquaintances, as is usually the case when friends meet after a long parting. I listened, and learned what I had to expect from the circle into which I had thus been introduced.

"The eldest daughter came back again hastily into the room, and seemed uneasy at not having found her sister. They were all concerned about her, and talked of this and the other bad habit which she had—with the exception of her father, who said, quite quietly—let her alone, children—she will come back when her own time comes! At this very moment she came in at the door—and then sure enough a most lovely star arose over the horizon of this rustic heaven. Both daughters were dressed in the German fashion, as it was then called, and this almost exploded national costume sat with particular grace on

Friederike. A little short white frock with a flounce, just short enough to show her pretty little feet and ancles, a little white bodice, and a black satin apron—thus she stood halfway between a peasant girl and a daughter of the city. Slender and light—she moved as if her clothes were no weight to her, and her delicate neck seemed almost too slender for the profusion of fair locks which adorned her well-formed head. She glanced brightly around with her clear blue eyes, and her nice little nose, slightly *retroussé*, seemed to breathe the air as freely as if there had been no such thing as sorrow in the world. Her straw hat hung from her arm, and thus I had the happiness, at the first glance, to see her in all her grace and all her loveliness."

Goethe, as may be supposed after this description, was not slow in opening the trenches, and laying siege, with all his might, to the heart of this charming little personage, and in this his conduct is perhaps not greatly to be censured, or if it be, there are probably not a great many men who would be entitled to sit upon the jury which should condemn him.

The desire to obtain the esteem and even the affection of a beautiful woman, is with most men, in the first instance, an involuntary and almost invincible impulse, nor is it blameable, except when indulged in such circumstances, or to such a height as to endanger the happiness of the beloved object. It is in failing to exercise those restraining influences, which time and reflection must bring to the aid of every man of good sense and good feeling, that culpability alone exists.

During supper the resemblance to the Wakefield family impressed itself more and more upon Goethe, till at last the appearance of a younger son, who sprang into the room, and without almost noticing the guests, took his seat at table, and made a vigorous attack upon the viands, almost forced him to exclaim, "and are you there also, Master Moses!"

Friederike was Goethe's companion at table, and their mutual frankness soon made them friends. When supper was ended, his friend proposed a walk in the moonlight:—

"He offered his arm to the elder, I to the younger sister, and thus we wandered over the broad meadows, contemplating rather the heaven above us, than the earth which stretched itself out around us in a boundless plain. There was no moon-struck madness however, about Friederike's conversation. The clearness with which she expressed herself, converted night into day; and there was nothing in what she said which either indicated, or necessarily awakened sentimentality; except that her remarks had reference to me more than formerly. She acquainted me with what it was desirable I should know, with reference to her own position—the country in which she lived, and her acquaintances, and added a hope that I would make no ex-

ception to the many strangers, who having once visited them, gladly did so again.

"It gave me no small pleasure to listen to the picture which she thus drew of the little world in which she moved, and of the persons whom she most esteemed. By this means, she gave me a clear, and at the same time, an amiable view of her own position, which had a singular influence upon me, for I was seized at once with a feeling of regret, that it had not sooner been my fate to live by her side, and at the same time with jealousy and suspicion, towards all those who had formerly had the happiness to surround her. I listened with the most jealous attention, as if I had already had a right to do so, to all the descriptions which she gave of men; it mattered not under what denomination they came, whether they were neighbours or cousins, or god-fathers,—and I laid my suspicions now upon the one, now upon the other, though considering my perfect ignorance of the relative position of the parties, it was impossible that I could discover anything of the real state of matters. She became more and more talkative, I more and more silent. It was so pleasant to listen to her, and now that I could perceive nothing about her but her voice—her features being hidden by the darkness which covered the rest of the world, it seemed to me as if I saw into her very heart, a heart which could not be other than pure, since she could thus open it before me, with so little constraint."

The night was spent in interrupting the sleep of his friend, with all possible questions regarding Friederike, "Was she in love, or had she been? or was she a bride?" And on the morrow follow a number of comical scenes, arising out of the gradual discovery by the different members of the family, of the false colours under which till then, he had sailed. A declaration of mutual affection takes place between him and Friederike, in a scene which is rendered delightful by the air of simple rustic life, and of sincere youthful passion with which he has contrived to invest it. In the evening the little party retired to a shady bower, where Goethe gave them a specimen of his inventive powers, by extemporizing a little tale, with which he tells us, his audience was enchanted, and he himself was so well pleased, that he afterwards committed it to paper, and published it, under the title of "*Die neue Melusine*." He seems indeed to have possessed in an eminent degree the talents of an "improvisatore;" and when Dr. Gall the phrenologist examined his head, he informs us that he pronounced him to have been intended by nature for a popular orator. "A revelation," says Goethe, "which filled me with no small consternation, since, had it been true, the efforts of my whole life must have been, and continued to be, a struggling against nature, seeing that there is no opportunity for oratorical displays in Germany."

On Goethe's return to Strasbourg, he found the study of the

Law still less enticing than it had formerly been, and even the medical lectures which he had attended for his amusement, had lost much of their charm. Some necessary preparations for passing his examination, were accordingly despatched as quickly as possible, and *Sesenheim* again found him a guest, wandering by the side of the beloved *Friederike*. Our space prohibits us from attempting to place before our readers more of these sunny scenes than are necessary in order to put them in possession of the character of this fair saint, to whose shrine the worshippers of Goethe have since thought proper to direct their pious steps.

Those who are curious on the subject will find ample opportunity of gratifying their wishes for farther information in the "*Pilgrimage to Sesenheim*," published so lately as 1840, and edited by no less a personage than Varnhagen von Ense. Most persons, however, will probably find a greater charm in Goethe's own simple descriptions; and to those who are not already acquainted with them, we confidently recommend them as their next "after dinner reading." One passage, in which the whole being of *Friederike* is laid open with peculiar felicity, we shall transcribe before parting:—

"The friendly greetings of the peasants, which were chiefly directed to her, shewed that they regarded her as a beneficent being, in whose presence they felt at ease. In the house the elder sister was her mother's chief assistant, nothing that required much bodily exertion being required of *Friederike*, whom they spared, they said, in consequence of the weakness of her chest.

"There are some females who please us more in a room, others who appear to best advantage in the open air: *Friederike* belonged to the latter class. Her figure, her whole nature, never appeared so enchanting as when she was tripping lightly along some elevated foot-path. The grace of her gait seemed to rival the flowery earth on which she trod, and the unclouded serenity of her lovely countenance to contend with the clear blue of the heaven. The joyous and exhilarating ether which thus continually surrounded her, she contrived to bring with her even into the house, and well did she understand how to arrange little misunderstandings, and by the gaiety of her manner lightly to remove all disagreeable impressions.

"The purest pleasure which one can find in the person of a beloved object is in seeing that she is equally the delight of others. *Friederike's* conduct always exercised a beneficent influence on the society in which she moved. On our walks she glided hither and thither an enlivening spirit—filling up gaps wherever they showed themselves. We have already extolled the lightness of her motions, and indeed in no position was she so charming as when she ran. As a roe seems to fulfil the intentions of nature when it bounds lightly over the shooting corn, so her whole being seemed to find its perfect expression, when lightly skimming over heath and meadow, she ran to fetch something

which had been forgotten, to seek something that had been lost, to call in a distant pair, or to arrange something necessary for the common enjoyment. In these exercises she never got out of breath in the smallest degree, and preserved her balance with the utmost grace, a circumstance which showed that there was no great cause for the anxiety which her parents had about her chest."

One can scarcely imagine any situation in which such a being as this could have been other than the pride and the joy of him whom she loved, and the sacrifice of any fancied advantage in social position would have been, one would think, nothing more than what a lover would have rejoiced in being able to lay at her feet. What, then, will our readers think of the sincerity of Goethe's feelings, or of the goodness of heart of which he often boasts, when they hear that no sooner did this little rustic family make its appearance in Strasbourg, in order to enjoy the society of their city connexions, who, as he himself informs us, were of a good position and in easy circumstances, than he felt something which, notwithstanding the circumlocution with which he has confessed it, was neither more nor less than shame for the awkwardness of their manners, and the homeliness of their attire. The mother, who had been probably brought up in town, and had seen good society in early life, behaved herself, he tells us, like other ladies, but the eldest daughter was like a fish out of the water, and even Friederike, with her poor little old-fashioned German dress, was not suitable for her new position.

Though on one occasion he read the whole play of Hamlet aloud to a large audience in order to please her, (or perhaps to gratify his own vanity,) he had not the manliness to set himself so far above the silly conventionalities with which he was surrounded, as sincerely to enjoy her society, and at last he fairly confesses that when the family left Strasbourg, he felt as if a stone were taken off his heart. All that we afterwards hear of Friederike, is that he likens his passion for her to a bomb, which mounting gradually into the air, seems to mingle with the stars, and even for a while to remain among them; but afterwards describing the converse of its upward course, descends again to the earth, where it spreads destruction and havoc around it. There was no fault on her side; for he says, that she remained ever the same, nor thought, nor wished to think, that their intercourse was to come to so speedy an end. He, however, had determined that it should be so. He had gained from it all that he wished, which was momentary gratification, and experience of life; and although he makes a farce of having been for some time heart-broken at the inevitable parting, his conduct leaves little doubt, that he folded up within the recesses of his own selfish heart, every recollection connected with her, with pretty much the

same composure with which he may have stitched together the notes which he had taken at one of his favourite medical lectures.

True, he had done her no injury of which the law could take account, or on which even the rules of society could pronounce their ban, and he does not seem to have done, even what he did on a future occasion, viz., to have broken a promise of marriage; and the calculating man of the world may think that he only availed himself of the opportunity for retraction, which always remains open before the final conclusion of every bargain. Those, however, who regard such matters from a higher point of view, will not probably be disposed to pronounce upon him so lenient a sentence. He had excited and long continued to cherish and foster, by every means in his power, hopes which he never intended to gratify, and from gratifying which he was hindered by nothing but his own selfishness, and his own weakness. The excuse that he was a minor, and that it was at the worst only a piece of youthful folly and rashness, is a justification which we can see no grounds for admitting. For our own part, we see neither folly nor rashness in the matter. If he was not already of age, and there is reason to believe that he was, he was at least thoroughly responsible for what he did—he was standing on the very threshold of a profession which by his great talents, (of which he was perfectly conscious,) and the influence of his friends, could at once have been rendered a lucrative one; and besides, he was the son of a wealthy and doting affectionate father, who never would have ultimately thwarted him in any reasonable wish. We cannot imagine circumstances more favourable for the contraction of a lasting and honourable connexion, and we can scarcely regard the misfortunes which waited upon all his future endeavours after matrimonial bliss, in any other light than as a just retribution for his conduct on this occasion. With these observations we shall dismiss the man with his deeds, and turn our attention to the monuments which the artist has raised over the ashes of poor Friederike's love.*

Amongst the dramatic compositions of Goethe, we confess that the bold and irregular play of *Götz von Berlichingen*, has ever held a prominent place in our affections. The life-like reality with which the scenes of that rude and sturdy time are placed before our eyes, reminds us at every page of the writings of our own Shakspeare. The Boar's Head tavern in East Cheap, is scarcely more familiar to us than Götz's Castle of Ixthausen, or the palace of the Bishop of Bamberg. We mingle familiarly in the

* Those who are anxious to see a defence of Goethe's conduct on this occasion, will find it in the "*Pilgrimage to Eesenheim*," above referred to.

picturesque throng which crowds their courts and halls, and every face is the face of an old acquaintance. So intimate, indeed, is our knowledge of their individual peculiarities, that it seems to us, as if we could predict what each would say, and how he would bear himself. Old Götz himself, ever upright and honourable—with no wonderful share of acuteness, but at the same time no fool in worldly matters—overbearing, but not selfish—bold, and even ferocious when thwarted, but kind and tenderly affectionate to his family and his friends, is the very model of a good knight of the olden time. We stop not to inquire whether the character is consistent with that which has been handed down by authentic history. Whatever he may have done on other occasions, Goethe has here nowise overstepped the legitimate license of the dramatist in raising the character of his hero. He has neither distorted nor misrepresented—he has simply elevated. We are willing to accept the character as he has given it; and most of us, probably, when we think of the Knight of the Iron Hand, will think of him rather as the Götz of the drama, than as the not very consistent leader of the peasant war, whose faults and failings modern writers of history have been at pains to bring into view. Then there is his noble wife—the bold, true-hearted, simple, but dignified German matron, of whom her husband says, that “God gives such wives as he to those whom he loves.” Then there is George—“the golden boy,” the joyous and light-hearted aspirant to chivalry, whom old Götz loved as a part of himself, and who is indeed the very perfection of boys. With the elegant and tender-hearted Weislingen we are compelled to sympathize, notwithstanding his faithlessness and his many faults, for these are the result more of his accidental position than of his vices. On him, as on Hamlet, has been laid a burden too great for him to bear, and we cannot help wishing that his temptations had been more proportioned to his powers of resistance. Adelheid has the horrible basilisk-charm of a female Iago; but of all the best beloved is the gentle sister of Götz—the tender, womanly, Maria von Berlichingen. We know of no character, even in the writings of Shakspeare himself, more perfectly feminine and delicate, and at the same time more thoroughly free from every approach to over-refinement. She is, in our opinion, beyond all question, the best specimen of a *gentlewoman* to be met with in Goethe’s writings, and she alone is sufficient to remove from him the reproach of having been unable to comprehend that peculiar delicacy and purity of sentiment which, in our pride, we are sometimes tempted to claim as the exclusive birthright of an English lady. Mary of Berlichingen would do no discredit to the bed-chamber of our Queen.

We cannot trace in her much of the character of Friederike, and if she was, as Goethe says, in his mind when he drew the character of Maria, he must have portrayed rather what she might have become, than what she was when he knew her. We suspect that the resemblance between the characters and conduct of the lovers—between Weislingen and himself—is considerably nearer. Maria has less vivacity than Friederike—there is more of a gentle reserve in her presence, and tender affection, rather than passionate fondness, is the character of her love.

The conversation between her and her little nephew Karl, is one of the most skilful things of the kind with which we are acquainted—her part is so perfectly that of a woman—his so thoroughly that of a child. The scene, however, in which she finds her faithless lover, Weislingen, on his deathbed, poisoned by the hand of his mistress, the haughty and heartless Adelheid, when she comes to beg for her brother's life, is the perfection of pathos.

In the Maria of Clavigo the resemblance to Friederike is more apparent; though to us, at all events, she is a much less interesting character than the sister of the iron-handed Götz. She is a lively, passionate, French girl, with something more of tenderness, and a good deal more of constancy, than usually belong to the vivacious daughters of Gaul. In her lover, Clavigo, we have also much more both of the character and conduct of Goethe than in Weislingen. He is represented as an accomplished scholar, and elegant man of the world, whose better feelings, though never extinguished, were continually proving too weak for the selfishness with which they had to contend. In his desertion of Marie de Beaumarchais, he is actuated by precisely the same motives which induced Goethe to abandon Friederike, the very vulgar ones, viz. of feeling that his social position was now in some degree superior to hers, and the hope of making a better match. This double confession of a single act, (in Götz and Clavigo,) is remarkable as an illustration of that tendency which seems to exist in all minds, even the strongest, to confess in some way or another whatever they themselves feel that they have done amiss; and it is a proof of what Goethe himself says somewhere in his Autobiography, that his whole works may be regarded as a series of confessions, of which that work was the supplement. Nor is it unworthy of note, that he has represented the aberrations of conduct, both of Weislingen and of Clavigo, as the result of the influence of more resolute characters, by whose consistent wickedness they were in a measure held in subjection, whereas there is no indication of any thing analogous having existed in his own case: a proof, it would seem, that he considered the self-suggested heartlessness of his own conduct as incapable of being clothed with interest even in a drama.

Before we quit the gallery of Goethe's beauties, there is one other face to which we cannot refrain from calling the attention of our readers. It is that of a simple, love-sick girl, of one whom Goethe himself has spoken of as one of nature's maidens, and on whom Schiller has also pronounced a very eloquent panegyric. We allude, as many will divine, to the Clärchen in *Egmont*. She belongs rather to the class of which we formerly spoke than to that of which Maria von Berlichingen may be considered as the type; and we should not have reverted to the subject of Goethe's childlike female characters, had it not been partly from the feeling that we had unjustly overlooked her when formerly treating of them, and partly from the circumstance of *Egmont* belonging as a composition altogether to the time of Goethe's maturity. We are quite of Schiller's mind with reference to the dramatic error which is involved in the circumstance of her appearance at all; and we regard it, moreover, as a singular and lamentable proof of Goethe's perverted moral taste, that he considered a parting scene between a fictitious Egmont and his mistress, more likely to enlist the sympathies of his readers, than one such as must actually have taken place, between an affectionate husband and a loving wife. Poetical license is one thing, and poetical slander is another; and if poor Egmont, with all his faults, left at the last an unblemished moral character, we see no reason why he should in this respect be needlessly misrepresented.

Whether Schiller was entitled to cast the first stone at Goethe in behalf of good taste, at all events, will perhaps seem a question to those who remember the parting scene between Leicester and Mary Stuart in his own drama. But leaving the vexed question as to whether poor Clärchen ought or ought not to have been where she is, there are few of our readers, we believe, who will not hail her as a beautiful creation wherever she may be, and some of them, perhaps, will thank us for the little glance which we shall give them of her, as she walks to and fro in her mother's humble abode in Brussels, waiting for her lord.

“CLARA AND HER MOTHER ALONE.

Mother. “Such a love as Brackenburg's I have never seen; I thought such things were to be found only in the histories of the saints.”—
(*Brackenburg was an honourable suitor for Clara's hand.*)

Clärchen, (*walking up and down through the room, humming a song between her lips,*)

“Happy alone
Is the spirit that loves.”

Mother. “He knows of thy intercourse with Egmont, and I believe if you would show him a little kindness, he would marry you yet.”

Clärchen. (*sings,*)

“ Joyful
 And sorrowful,
 Thoughtful in vain ;
 Hoping
 And fearing,
 Alternating pain ;
 Heaven-high shouting,
 The saddest that lives ;
 Happy alone
 Is the spirit that loves.”

Mother. “ Leave off that ranting, child.”

Clärchen. “ Don’t scold me for it, mother. It is a powerful song. I have sung full-grown children to sleep with it before now.”

Mother. “ Thou hast nothing in thy head but that love of thine. Would that thou couldst think of something else. Brackenburg might place you in an honourable condition, I tell you. He may still make thee happy.”

Clärchen. “ He ?”

Mother. “ O yes ! a time will come ! You children cannot look before you, and will not listen to our experience. Youth and love all come to an end, and a time may come when you will thank God for a roof to cover you.”

Clärchen. (*Shudders, is silent, and then exclaims,*) “ Mother, let that time come as death will come ! To think of it beforehand is horrible. And, when it comes ! When we must—then we shall bear ourselves as we may. Egmont ! to renounce you ! (*in tears.*) No ! it is impossible—impossible !”

Clärchen’s little song, in this scene, short though it is, is one of the most powerful of Goethe’s lyric compositions. It is, indeed, as she calls it, “ ein kräftig Lied.” As an outpouring of the emotions of a passionate and loving heart, we know not its equal. The translation which we have given, we present to our young lady readers, as only one degree better than the very miserable one which they will find in their music-books. The original, however, with the beautiful music of Beethoven, we recommend to their serious consideration ; and we think it might, without prejudice, be adopted as a substitute for “ Woodman, spare that tree,” or, “ Ye marble Halls,” or, “ Beautiful Venice,” or, indeed, for most others of the lays of modern England with which they are at present in the habit of lulling their papas to slumber.

Did our limits permit, we would gladly linger in the society of the beautiful daughters of Goethe’s brain, and the names of many of them, we are sure, would require only to be mentioned, in order to rekindle the enthusiasm with which our readers must have once regarded them. The majestic form of *Iphigenie* would rise up afresh, with its statue-like beauty, and the childish tenderness

of the melancholy Mignon would again claim a tear. In the gay and profligate Philline we should still take pleasure, in spite of our disapproval, and the two Leonoras would once more divide our admiration and our love. But we must hasten away from the enchanted circle, and we shall detain our readers only with a very few observations on the characteristic differences between the female characters of Goethe and those of our own great dramatist.

Goethe's females are less dignified, less heroic, so to speak, than those of Shakspeare. They are truer to nature, not in the higher sense of what nature might and would produce in given circumstances, but in the lower sense of what she usually does produce, and what we see around us in the ordinary intercourse of the world. They are one degree farther removed from the antique, in that they are less the embodiments of abstract passion, and approach nearer to the complexity of ordinary nature. Nor have they the power of Shakspeare's females. Tenderness and sweetness are their chief characteristics. There is not one of them, so far as we know, who could support the passion even of Juliet, or in whose nature such a passion, if represented, would not be felt to be an incongruity. How different is the part which Portia plays from that which Goethe has assigned, or could with propriety have assigned, to any of his female characters! In female characterization, as in every other department of dramatic composition, we hold religiously to the opinion that no poet, ancient or modern, has ever equalled Shakspeare, and we are disposed to place the female characters of Goethe, both poetically and morally, on a lower level than his. Still, they are as they should be. The ages for heroic conception are gone—gone, so far as we can see, beyond recall; and the epic, we fear, is not the only form of poetic composition which is unsuited to our time. In Shakspeare's days the middle age still lingered with a sunset glow, and its grandeur was blended in his imagination, with the bright soft tints of the coming time. He stood, as it were, upon a height, between the day which had been and the day which was to be, and his eye descried the dawn, whilst the rays of the evening still gilded the west. Even the majestic shadows of the Roman grandeur may be supposed to have stretched to him; for it was the cloud which had sunk down upon it which was rising on all sides when Shakspeare was born. It was the same with the great painters of Italy; and in their works we see much of the majesty of classic art—not copied, but still remaining in spirit—united to the picturesque luxuriance of the Middle Ages, and the clear conception and perfect *technique* of modern times. Goethe, again, is the poet of an altogether new civilization—of a social condition, the result, no doubt, of those

elements of change and of progression which were at work in the days of Shakspeare and of Raphael, but still differing in its developed state most essentially from what it was in the period of its formation. His poetry is the only kind of poetry which was possible, as original and indigenous poetry, in an age in which clearness, precision, and reality have taken the place of the magnificent and the ideal; and it is thus a legitimate consequence of the condition out of which they arose, that his women should be as we find them—mere “comfit-makers’ wives,” and “Sunday citizens,” when placed side by side with those of Shakspeare. They are real women, however—perfectly simple, and free from mawkish artificiality—perfectly graceful, but at the same time divested of all the dignity which is derived from position, and with which the circumstances of the time permitted Shakspeare to invest his characters. A queen or a princess in Shakspeare’s days, and to Shakspeare, was a very different person from what she is in our days, and to us. Partly, she was different in herself; for it cannot be doubted that the almost sacred reverence with which rank was then regarded must have effected, to some extent, a change on the natural characters of those to whom it belonged. Chiefly, however, she was different to him; for she was raised to a height, and surrounded by an atmosphere, which allowed his imagination free scope to gild her at will, and he has drawn her, of course, as he conceived her. The relations which subsisted between the different classes of the community, and the feelings with which they mutually regarded each other, were then altogether different from what they now are. The sharp and rigid distinctions which then marked the different steps on the social ladder were unquestionably favourable to feelings of mutual respect. The affectation of contempt with which the high and the low now regard each other, and the ridiculous light in which they contrive to exhibit their respective characteristics, is the result of a jealousy on the one hand, and of an envy on the other, which could have found no place where rivalry was excluded by the very constitution of the society in which men lived. Where encroachment was not dreaded, mutual respect and kindly feeling naturally became the connecting links between the different classes of men, instead of ridicule and unbelief being, as with us, the principles which jumble all ranks together. No “Punch” appeared then on the Saturday mornings, to hold up to the laughter of the land, the royal banquet of the previous night. If there had, what glorious matter he would have found in the doings of our gracious lady, Elizabeth. No “leader” had then even mooted the opinion that royalty was a pageant kept up merely for the convenience of the community, and for preserving the symmetrical appearance of the Constitution. Shaks-

peare did not labour, as we do, and as Goethe did, under the disadvantages which, according to Louis XIV., beset the valets of the great; and, consequently, there were some men, and women too, who did continue to be heroes to him.

The merit of Goethe on the other hand is, that he read the newspapers all his days, and that he was a poet notwithstanding. Nay, that he has proved to us, that while men and women feel, love, and suffer, the poet's occupation will remain. He might have imitated Shakspeare and the older poets if he had chosen, as he has imitated the Greeks in *Iphigenie*; but if he had, he would not have been as he is—the poet of the nineteenth century. The true province of the poet, and this Goethe knew, is to embody in their greatest purity and their greatest strength, the sentiments and feelings of his age. He is and must be the æsthetic expression of his time. Even the poets of France, the least original of all to whom the name has ever been conceded—were so to a certain extent against their will; and their tiresome imitations of the antique, are a standing monument of the want of healthy and original life, which then characterized their country. The same observations apply with equal force to the other departments of the fine arts, and it requires no prophet to foretell, that if ever we should have a *true* school of painting or sculpture in Europe again, it will bear to that which sprung up in Italy at the close of the Middle Ages, the same relation which the poetry of Goethe does to the poetry of Shakspeare.

So much for one, and perhaps the chief cause of the difference, which we perceive between Goethe and Shakspeare's female characters; but there is another which no doubt had its influence, and which we ought not to pass over unnoticed. It is the difference of feeling, with regard to the female sex, prevalent in the two countries to which the poets respectively belonged. In Germany a woman is a being to be loved and cherished, but not to be revered and adored, as she was in England in Shakspeare's time, and still is to some extent. The sphere of her activity is consequently more limited, she is a less prominent personage in the eyes of the world, and less important in her own, and hence the homeliness of her manners, and the greater preponderance of the strictly domestic virtues. Every English man on first coming in contact with German women, is struck with the absence, even in the very highest classes, of what is vulgarly denominated "style." Their object is not to attract admiration, but to engage the affections—they appeal not to the eye, but to the heart, and hence there is in their manners for the most part, what in an Englishwoman would be an affectation of simplicity. An intelligent Englishman (Dr. Bisset Hawkins) writing about Germany some years ago, said that there was

no other nation in the world, where the natural woman was so easily discoverable under the social crust, and the truth of the observation will be confirmed by all who have had an opportunity of forming an opinion from personal observation. The whole education of a German woman indeed tends to bring about this result. Trained from the first to domestic duties in the bosom of her family, her early education differs as much as can well be imagined from the convent education of France, or the showy and too often superficial instruction which falls to the lot of the English maiden. She is not educated for show, nor regarded as an ornament, and the consequence is that she is rarely either showy or ornamental.

Of this species of woman we have a complete exemplification in the Charlotte of *Werther's Leiden*, who, notwithstanding the violence of the passion which she excites, is all along represented as a plain, simple, unpretending housewife. Her lover is evidently a fine gentleman, and an intellectual fop besides of the very first water; but we see nothing of the accomplished miss or of the fine lady about Charlotte. She is a woman simply, and the charm which attaches to her is altogether apart from conventional feeling. In this respect, as in many others, Goethe's women often remind us of the females who figure in the dialogues of Erasmus. When we read of these as *puellæ*, *feminæ*, *uiores*, *matronæ*, or under whatever other title they may appear, we think of them simply as well-developed specimens of female humanity, but without the slightest reference to their position in the world. Poverty does not weigh upon them, nor does wealth puff them up. They are neither exalted by the deference of others, nor depressed by the absence of self-respect. They are not learned; for although their conversation is reported in Latin, they are supposed to have spoken in the vulgar tongue. Neither are they ignorant; for on every subject on which the interlocutor addresses them, they are extremely intelligent and ready-witted. They are simply, as we said before, *puellæ*, *feminæ*, *uiores*, *matronæ*, &c., with such a degree of wealth, of station, of learning, and of intelligence, as to render them normal specimens of the human being of the sex at the period of life, and otherwise in the circumstances in which they are represented.

To some of our readers it may seem strange that Erasmus should be spoken of as a poet, and, stranger still, that he should be instanced as a successful delineator of female character. With ourselves, however, we confess that several of his women have long been especial favourites—the Maria, for instance, in the “*Proci et Puellæ*,” the Catharina (Virgo *Μισογamos*), the Fabulla, and even the unfortunate Lucretia. The characteriza-

tion is excellent ; for although there is a great similarity observable in them all, they have each a distinct individual existence. In reading the dialogues, short though they be, we seem, as it were, to make their acquaintance, and to become familiar with their respective peculiarities. Catharina, for instance, is by far the most poetical ; and indeed we know few things more beautiful than the quaint, half-sportive conversation between her and her lover, when they are first presented to us in the garden after the banquet.

Eubulus. "Gaudeo tandem finitam esse cœnam, ut liceat hac frui deambulatione, qua nihil amœnius."

Cath. "Et me jam tædebat sessionis."

Eu. "Quam vernal, quam arridet undique mundus ! Hæc nimirum est illius adolescentia."

Cath. "Sic est."

Eu. "At cur tuum ver non æque arridet."

Cath. "Quam ob rem ?"

Eu. "Quia subtristis es."

Cath. "An videor alio vultu quam soleo ?"

Eu. "Vis ostendam te tibi ?"

Cath. "Maxime."

Eu. "Vides hanc rosam, sub imminentem noctem, foliis contractionibus ?"

Cath. "Video, quid tum postea ?"

Eu. "Talis est vultus tuus."

Cath. "Bella collatio."

Eu. "Si mihi parum credis, in hoc fonticulo contemplare teipsum, &c."

So far, indeed, we have not much of Catharina, and she delivers her short responses with the coyness of one who expected to be wooed ; but the manner in which her lover, who is perfectly up to his business, endeavours to arrive at her understanding and her heart, through the medium of her imagination, shows sufficiently the natural tendency of her mind. The whole scene breathes of the freshness of the garden ; and we can picture to ourselves, without an effort, the two lovers walking over the close-shorn green, and listening to the gentle murmuring of the water, as it trickled into the fountain in which Catharina was to contemplate her beauty. We are strikingly reminded of the garden scene of Faust—and Catharina, in many respects, might pass for the sister of Gretchen. Her character is finely brought out as the dialogue proceeds, and her conscientious scruples about matrimony are shaken, though not overcome.

In the dialogue which follows, and which is supposed to take place after she had made trial of the convent, we have a return to the feelings which naturally belong to a girl of her age ; and

Eubulus is rewarded for his former unsuccessful argumentation, by a declaration on the part of the young lady, that of all the friends in whom she trusted,—“nunc sentio nullum fuisse, qui mihi prudentius ac senilius consilium dederit, quam tu omnium natu minimus.” These, like most of the other dialogues, are pointed against the abuses of the monastic system, and the sophisms by which the priests in the days of Erasmus were in the habit of working upon the tender consciences of young and impressionable females; but he has contrived to present the argument in so attractive a form, that we read it like a drama, scarcely thinking for the time of the chief object with which it was written. The daughters of this old worm-eaten theologian, are wits too in their own quiet way; and there are few more amusing instances of continued repartee, than the manner in which Maria defends herself from the attacks of Pamphilus, when he undertakes to prove to her, on the principle of the old adage, “animam hominis non illic esset ubi animat, sed ubi amat,” that he is dead, and she is his murderess. The discussion too between Eutrapelus and Fabulla, (the *puerpera*,) in which she challenges him, “Die quae te causae moveant, ut felicius existimes peperisse catulum, quam catellam,” is ineffably droll in many parts. The whole of the dialogues indeed are sparkling with wit; and as they are generally carried on between a man and a woman, no inconsiderable part of it must necessarily fall to the share of the ladies. In this respect they differ altogether from Goethe’s females, for in their mouths we seldom find anything that is witty, and indeed Goethe himself, was by no means so great a wit as Erasmus.

- ART. II.—1. *The Angler's Companion to the Rivers and Lochs of Scotland.* By THOMAS TOD STODDART. Edinburgh and London, 1847.
2. *A Handbook of Angling: Teaching Fly-fishing, Trolling, Bottom-fishing, and Salmon-fishing.* By EPHEMERA. London, 1847.

THE Art of Angling has for a length of time been among the most highly favoured, and most assiduously pursued, of all our British sports, and any contributions which tend either to explain its theory, or improve its practice, cannot be otherwise than welcome to a piscatorial public. It is pleasant to read about angling during wintry weather, when close-time and the fear of water-bailiffs debar the uses of the rod; and when the remembrance of bright and balmy summer days, all past and gone, and, it may be, the anticipation of still more genial seasons yet to come, throw a radiance even over the surrounding actualities of frost and snow,—the imagination of the “Contemplative Angler” being, at the same time, no doubt, considerably enlivened by the sparkling presence of a steady though consuming fire.

That the study of works on angling during the other seasons of the year,—the genial spring, the sultry summer, or the melancholy, though many-coloured “fall,” is productive of equal advantage, is another question. The fire-side pleasure, and the water-side profit, of such works, are two distinct matters, though each is well worthy of attentive consideration in its way. That one man may read about angling by the household hearth till his shoes are consumed from off his feet, and his winter store of coals reduced to ashes, and know nothing of the subject after all, is just as certain as that another man may be a first-rate angler without having ever had in hand a single book upon his much-loved art. This only proves the truth of the old adage—that “practice is better than precept,”—a saying which we don’t here quote as any thing very original, but rather as being peculiarly applicable to the art of angling, with a brief consideration of which we are now about to beguile ourselves, if not our readers.

Let the student, then, bear thoughtfully in mind, that angling differs in many respects from most other subjects—for example, history—and in nothing more than this, that books, by themselves books, are of no earthly use. The achievements of Alexander the Great, of Julius Cæsar, and other men of renown, we fear, can now be only learned “from the record,” seeing that they lived and died, came, saw, and conquered, in ages long gone by,

into which we cannot cast ourselves; and certain it is, that no exploration now-a-days of the banks of the Granicus will tell us who headed the Macedonian phalanx, and overthrew Darius and his 600,000 Persians, (surely a numerous people, if not a strong,) any more than a walk, however lengthened, along the Rubicon, even from its lowly Adriatic mouth to gurgling fount on rocky Apennine, will tell us who crossed it one fine day, when perhaps he ought not to have done so,—at least if he respected the Senate, or feared Pompey and a civil war. The student of these passages in history may practise what he pleases by the sides of famous streams, but they will tell him nothing unless he also deeply ponders over many a dark and dismal-looking volume, the very names of which we scarcely know, and if we did, would almost fear to write; but we are sure that his notes would not be of Limerick hooks (O'Slaughnessy's), or Kirby bends, of lance-wood, hickory, whalebone, or bamboo; nor yet of mohair, dubbing, silk, or silver-twist; nor of any form of feathers or their huc, "white, black, and grey, with all their trumpery." Instead of these would stand such mystical memoranda as the following:—"Diod. 17.—Plut. in Alex.—Justin.—Curt. iii. c. 1.—Lucan. i. v. 185 and 213.—Strab. 5.—Suet. in Cæs. 32:"—and, for anything we can aver to the contrary, the supposed student might not be much wiser than he was before, in spite of all this dread array. But the true piscator must be practical in all his ways; for no perceptive teaching can give the steady arm and all-observing eye, or that peculiar combination of their powers by which an adept's artificial fly is made—after a semi-circular sweep in upper air—to vault boldly across a raging river, and alight upon its surface within a couple of inches of some chosen spot,—chosen either from past experience of its value, or it may be merely from that instinctive feeling by which a practised angler ascertains, even in unaccustomed waters,

"Where low submerged the princely salmon lies."

Neither can anything but ample and assiduous practice give that other combination of relentless firmness and gentle pliability, with which both rod and reel are managed, after the glittering lounge, or great up-heaving swell of sullen waters, followed by a whirl of line like an electric telegraph, has proved the hooking of some goodly fish, which, under the guidance of a master's hand, may rush and spring and flounder all in vain; but alas! in timid and unsteady tyro's keeping, rises like a silvery meteor, and instantaneously turning its head one way and its tail another, snaps the line with one indignant plunge,—

"A moment white, then gone for ever."

But although a man who "spareth the rod," can never effi-

ciently instruct himself or others in its practice, we do not mean to say that there is the slightest harm either in reading or in writing books on angling. On the contrary, as many respectable followers of the aquatic art are frequently and unfortunately laid up by rheumatism, the custom of reading a good deal, and writing a very little, may even be deemed advisable in certain cases—that is, where there is a remnant of reason, a remembrance of the first rules of grammar, some slight power of observation, discrimination, and expression, and a resolute resolve, while indulging in such works, never to lose temper as well as time, through the folly there abounding.

The germ or nucleus of Mr. Stoddart's present publication, is no doubt his small precursor entitled "The Art of Angling, as practised in Scotland," published so far back as 1835. We desire to refer for a moment to that former work, in order to give the author credit for his sound doctrine on the great parr question, even at that early period, when we confess our own mind was greatly darkened. He was of course quite ignorant, in common with all his brethren of the angle, of Mr. Shaw's original discovery of the slow progress of that fish's growth in fresh water, and of the consequent length of time during which it sojourned there; and, indeed, as respects this latter point, his views are somewhat vague and misty, if not altogether inaccurate even now. But that he, with a wise and discriminating instinct, felt, although he could not scientifically prove, that parr were young salmon, is, we think, apparent from the following paragraphs:—

"Three theories, barring the one of its being a distinct species, are abroad concerning the parr. The first and most general opinion is, that the parr belongs both to the trout and salmon species, and is a sort of mule betwixt them; the second theory maintained by some, reckons it to be the male of the sea-trout, whiting, or finnock; and the third, which is by far the soundest, is held, certainly, we confess, upon suspicious premises, by the Ettrick Shepherd, and assumes that the parr is nothing else than the fry of salmon. We shall consider these three opinions individually, and give our reasons for supporting the last."—*Scottish Angler*, p. 80.

Our author then sets himself to demolish the first two theories—a work of supererogation by no means difficult to do—and next endeavours to establish that which stands third in order, by a general reasoning not very accurate or conclusive in its way. But he then proceeds as follows:—

"Nor is our hypothesis altogether imaginary, for we come to the relation of a circumstance, the happening of which grounded our belief in this theory; and no assailable one it is, if our eyes, which are good, did not deceive us. Last spring, after the time when smoults

generally descend, we chanced to capture a few of them in St. Mary's loch, the streams about which are a favourite breeding-place for salmon. These were of a large kind, and had been prevented from joining the spring shoals, by their inability to discover the outlet to the lake; they were soft and loose in the scale, but seemingly an enticing bait for pike, which frequent a smaller sheet of water immediately above St. Mary's. In the afternoon, happening to use one of these smoults on our pike tackle, we remarked how its scales came off in great numbers, *discovering beneath a perfect parr, not to be mistaken in any one respect.* This incidental discovery we further confirmed by repeated experiments, and are now convinced beyond a doubt of the fact, that parr are the young of salmon in a certain state.

"Nor have we availed ourselves in the minutest degree of the observations of our friend the Ettrick Shepherd, in the *Agricultural Journal*; for we esteem his method of proof as somewhat fallacious, and at war with the established doctrine of chances; yet we have conversed with those who have asserted the accuracy of Mr. Hogg's statement, and we know it to be the constant practice of the bard of Altrive to mark the tail-fin of his parr with a peculiar incision, not difficult to recognise. We confess, however, that it is wonderful, first, that Mr. Hogg should be able to catch the ten thousandth portion of the parr frequenting Yarrow; second, that out of a few hundreds that he might catch and mutilate, such a number should reach the sea, undergo the many chances of disaster on their way thither, the more hideous perils of that element; that they should ascend to the exact stream of their birth, in preference to many others; and that when of good size and liable to be taken on ever so many occasions by human means, they should, escaping net and hook, otter and leister, arrive uninjured at Mr. Hogg's feet, and allow him to transfix them through and through, in order to discover their personal identity."—P. 86.

The most painful part of the discovery of the true character and status of the parr, is the fearful consequences which may now ensue to the youthful progeny of the human race. Although there has been no legislative enactment concerning parr, under that particular and appropriate name, yet the ascertainment of their being young salmon, brings them into the same category with that noble fish, and places them beneath the shelter of its shield and buckler. From this it follows, that if the Act be strictly enforced and followed out, all youthful anglers (and anglers indeed of every age, but we most compassionate the young) must, in all rivers haunted by salmon, be totally debarred the pleasure of the rod, or use it at their peril, under the risk of conviction and heavy fine; because, as in most rivers the majority of small trout, commonly so called, are actually parr or young salmon, it is impossible to angle, in however good faith, for genuine trout, without killing also genuine salmon; and so the son of a respectable attorney, (we suppose there are such people,) who encreeles, *inter*

alia and inadvertently, a few innocent parr, as yet unconscious even of incipient greatness, "shall forfeit and pay any sum not less than one pound sterling, and not exceeding ten pounds," besides forfeiting his rod or "other engine," whatever that may be. There is something most considerate and very soothing in the "not exceeding" termination of the clause, as exhibiting, under the very aggravated and heinous nature of the crime supposed, an almost heroic limitation of punishment. Only ten pounds for a parr! why a person would have to pay as much to a jeweller for a mock one, made of silver and precious stones, which yet doubtless would not be half so beautifully lustrous, nor so emblazoned with "orient pearls and gold," as the real samlet when it glanced and sparkled in the liquid light of the translucent stream. It is one of the cheapest things we ever heard of, although it is by no means unlikely that the poor lad may be sorely pushed before he can pay for it after all. But supposing this part of the case to be a hard one, far worse than any legal prosecution is the personal *persecution* which may and will take place throughout the live-long summer days, wherever a surly guardian of the river, on the look-out for prey, espies two or three as yet joyous urchins gathered together, near though not upon the village green. The village green, indeed! They are actually wading in the water, with long and rather scraggy legs, extremely bare, and their scant trousers tucked up, and rolled above their wall-worn knees. What business have they there at such a time? Is the river theirs, or aught that it contains? Most surely not; and what if the villains are contravening Act 9th Geo. IV., Sec. 4.* Who knows? Let us see, says the grim old water-bailiff, who was a noted nocturnal leisterer in his day, but having lost his right hand by the springing of a fox-trap, which he had set for hares, has now betaken himself to a less illegal, if not more legitimate vocation. The urchins are seized and examined, their pockets and pocket-handkerchiefs are emptied or unrolled, the "speckled parr" pounced upon and appropriated, and the youthful aspirants to the honours of a jointed rod, (as yet a willow-wand is all their boast,) reviled as poachers of the darkest hue, as having been actually caught killing salmon within view of the very school-house—(salary, the maximum, and fees several pounds per annum, with accommodation for a parlour boarder,)—where they might surely have been taught far better things, and with a considerable number of these valuable and most important fishes furtively concealed, though still alive, in a pint bottle. Their willow-wands are confiscated, and they themselves flee

* "That such as sell or have in possession smoults, or the young of salmon, or disturb the parent fish while spawning, shall be fined in sums not exceeding ten, nor under one pound sterling."

from the well-trodden turfy banks, and little gravelly bays of the ancestral stream, and betake themselves in terror, some (and these are chiefly orphans) to the lonely sides of pastoral mountains, others to their homes *maternal*, all losing half a Saturday, (its better half,) and dreaming for several nights successively of the inane, though to them dreadful because rubicund face of Justice Shallow, the "Triton of the Minnows," though no great judge of parr. This is indeed a new evil under the sun, and we see no help for it. Salmon, and fish of the salmon kind, whether old or young, have been almost immemorially, in some way or other, protected by an Act of Parliament; and boys, whether bare-legged or buskined, have likewise for time out of mind been in the custom of catching parr, thinking of no other *act* whatever but their own. In this peculiar posture of affairs, it may be considered as very questionable whether it was right, not as regards the civic economy of large towns, but the rural economy of small villages, and the juvenile privileges of the rising generation, both in town and country, that parr should have been ascertained to be the young of salmon at all. But as the discovery has been clearly made, and widely promulgated, it cannot now be concealed, and must therefore just be submitted to by all concerned. But how, in these times of anticipated restriction and prosecution, the country can expect in after days a body of fair and fearless anglers, such as have hitherto characterized and ennobled our beautiful river shores, we cannot take upon ourselves to say; yet we know that as colonies, commerce, and the navigation laws, have been as nurseries to our naval force, so has the angling of trout and parr ever formed the initiatory practice of all the mighty and renowned Nim-rods of our water-courses. Is it to be so now no more for ever? "The fishers also shall mourn, and all they that cast angles into the brook shall lament," although they that "spread nets upon the waters" need not languish.

Mr. Stoddart's present volume is so much more comprehensive and complete than his former one, that it may fairly be regarded altogether as a new and different work, and certainly one of the best and most important of its kind which has hitherto issued from the press. The author has been long and favourably known to both the angling and the literary world as an experienced sportsman and agreeable writer. Devoted to his art from early youth, a more recent residence of ten continuous years on Tweed-side, in the neighbourhood of Kelso, with the further experience of two seasons by the banks of salmon streams in the north of Scotland, has given him a large measure of acquaintance with the subject, and most ample opportunities both of special practice and general observation of things connected with his favourite

art, since he first indited his "*Scottish Angler*" in 1835.* His "*Angler's Companion*" of 1847, will therefore be found to be the most complete compendium of things new and old, and worthy of remembrance, which we possess upon the subject at the present time. He not only discusses the theory and practice of the art, with special directions in relation to fly and bait fishing for the principal species which occur in Scotland, but he also gives separate chapters containing local details regarding all our mighty rivers and their lesser streams,—extremely valuable as contributions to our general knowledge, and not only useful, but indispensable, as itineraries to guide the angler in his watery way. The very "contents" of these chapters are enough to make any man discontented both with time and space, during the present wintry weather, when he must endure himself and family by the fire-side. The Tweed, the Forth, the Tay, and of each of these the tributaries—themselves a world of waters infinite; the "rivers of Angus and Aberdeenshire;" the "rivers of the Moray Firth;" the "Beaully and Conan;" the "rivers of the Dornoch Firth;" the "Oikel, Cassley, Carron, and Shin, Loch Shin, Loch Craggie," and many more; the "Naver and Strathy, the Hope, Dinart, and Borgie, Loch Stack, the Laxford, the Inchard, the Lochs of Assynt, the river Ewe, Loch Maree, the Lewis;" then "the Awe, and rivers and lochs of Argyleshire;" "the Clyde and streams of the south-west," and "the rivers of the Solway Firth."

"Fate, drop the curtain, we can stand no more."

Mr. Stoddart's first chapter is occupied by his views regarding the river-trout, its character and habits; and contains many sound and sensible observations, along with certain statements of things which are hard to be understood. But of these anon.

"The trout is unquestionably a voracious feeder. It consumes, in proportion to its size, a greater quantity of sustenance than any other fresh-water fish; nor, in respect to the quality of its food, is it quite so scrupulous as is generally imagined. Look, for instance, at the variety it indulges in, according as the seasons, hours of the day, and state of the water or atmosphere, prompt and direct it. In this variety are embraced the whole of the insect tribes, winged or otherwise; frogs, leeches, worms, slugs, snails, maggots, cad-bait, every sort and size of fly, beetle, and moth, the water-spider, &c. Then there are fish—the smaller ones of its own species, parr or fingerlings, minnows, loaches, and sticklebacks, along with the roe or ova of salmon; and

* We believe that Mr. Stoddart also wrote an intermediate work, with which we are not ourselves acquainted, called "*Angling Reminiscences*," published in 1837.

I doubt not even young birds and water-rats are occasionally made prey of by hungry river-trout. Examine the stomach, and you will generally find a large mass composed of insect-remains in a partly digested state, and superadded sometimes to these the remnants of a parr, loach, or minnow. The carp, the tench, the pike, are not more varied in their feeding than the common fresh-water trout. Even the pike itself, although a fearless, vindictive, and rapacious fish, is less gluttonous in its habits, and in its tastes infinitely more simple and congruous.

“What is it, then, it may be asked, that renders the trout difficult of capture? Its greedy propensities, one might imagine, would naturally allow little room to the angler for the exercise of skill and judgment. But experience has taught otherwise; and the simple reason of this is, that with these propensities the trout unites epicure habits, caprice in its hours and seasons of feeding, cunning, shyness, and watchful distrust. As an epicure, it battens one day upon surface or winged food, and the next upon ground sustenance. Sometimes the minnow will attract it, sometimes the worm; sometimes, turning from both with dislike or satiety, it will amuse its palate with delicacies of the minutest description—the larvæ of water insects, or pellets of ova, picked up with address and assiduity from among the interstices of rocks and stones, from the foliage or roots of water-plants, or while floating past it in the descending current. And this caprice as to its food, while it tests the skill and experience of the angler, is assisted in doing so by the cunning and natural mistrust of the fish; its quick, vigilant eye; its keen, distinguishing sense of smell, and similar instinctive endowments and perceptions.”—P. 13.

These omnivorous propensities no doubt form the groundwork of its too often fatal affection, even for those fantastic artificial lures which anglers fondly call *flies*, because they sometimes in a certain small measure resemble these insects, and are made by impulsion of rod and line to wing their adventurous way, first through the air and then through the water, where assuredly they soon lose all resemblance to the things whose name they bear.

The size to which trout attain, and the rate of their increase of growth, depend greatly upon circumstances, and vary with the nature of particular localities. An extensive range of ground, with an abundant supply of good food, makes speedy amends for want of years; while, on the other hand, if a trout is planted in a spring well, although it be fed, even by the fairest hands, by night and day, its increase of dimensions will be slow and slight. This is probably owing to the want of diversity of aliment, and which debars the fish from choosing its food in accordance with what some might call caprice, but which we shall simply name the natural inclination of the moment. It is said that if you feed a human being upon pigeon pies for six

weeks, he either dies or becomes a maniac. We never chanced to try the experiment either on ourselves or others, and would certainly, in the present state of the money market, rather decline the hazard of a contract to pay the expense of pie and paste to more than an extremely limited number of Irish *navies* who might survive the trial—certainly more humane in itself than the administering of even infinitesimal quantities of arsenic, corrosive sublimate, prussic acid, or other poisonous and therefore rather unpleasant preparations, (as is the practice of physiologists,) to magnificent Newfoundland dogs, with lofty foreheads and thoughtful deep-set eyes—such as Landseer would love to paint—and tails that would turn round a man-of-war even during ebb-tide, with a single swinge. But that a variety of food is conducive to the exuberant growth both of man and the lower creatures is certain.

"In all lochs," says Mr. Stoddart, "characterized by good feeding-ground, and abundance of shelter, trout have a tendency to acquire large dimensions. This tendency, however, is frequently counteracted by the breeding accommodation, in the shape of streams or feeders, which afford great facility for spawning. Under such circumstances, the stock, instead of attaining to great size, become numerous, as is the case in many of our lochs, where the feeding grounds are both extensive and of good quality. The introduction of pike into such lochs aids, no doubt, in improving the dimensions and quality of the trout, but has not always this effect.

"For instance, St. Mary's Loch, in Selkirkshire, contains pike and perch in considerable abundance, and yet the trout continue comparatively numerous, and are not distinguished on account of their size, seldom exceeding a pound in weight, and averaging little more than half a pound. The breeding waters, consisting of Meggat, Yarrow, and five or six hill-burns which help to people the lake in question, are, in this instance, quite sufficient to keep up the supply, notwithstanding the ravages presumed to be committed by the fresh-water tyrant, which fish, I may mention, infests only the weedy portions of the loch, and is not found equally distributed, as is the case in Loch Leven, and many of our Highland sheets of water, around the margin. Were it so,—were every point of access to the shallows held in keeping by pike, most assuredly the trout would decrease in number; and should a fair proportion of their feeding-grounds remain at the same time accessible to them, they, as certainly, would increase in respect to size. We have illustrations of the fact afforded us by what has been noticed in a number of our Highland lochs: for instance, in Loch Tummel in Perthshire, in Loch Vennachar near Callander, also in Lochs Garve, Achnanault, and Ledgowan in Ross-shire. In all these expanses of water, the pike are numerous and pretty equally distributed along the margin, having the desirable shelter and accommodation. The trout associated with them are consequently not abundant; but, generally speaking, of large size,

They vary in point of weight from one and a half up to ten or twelve pounds weight.*

"It may be remarked, however, that lochs containing few or no pike, and where small trout, averaging from a quarter to one pound weight, are found in great abundance, not unfrequently, along with these, possess large individuals of the species, chiefly predatory in their habits, and which unquestionably commit havoc to a great extent among the others. Such fish have frequently been taken by trolling in Lochs Laggan, Tay, Ness, and Earn, where the trout captured with the fly seldom exceed a pound in weight, and are generally not so heavy. These monsters, I may observe, are quite different in character from the *Salmo ferox* of Lochs Awe and Shin; they are merely overgrown loch-trout, of the same variety as the general stock of the lake they inhabit, or one or other of its tributaries. They have been captured, I am told, weighing 20 lbs. and upwards; nor shall I dispute the accuracy of this statement, but feel inclined to give it full credence."—P. 17.

We are not quite sure as to the fact inferred in the two concluding sentences of the preceding paragraph—that these enormous trout are in truth the same as the general stock of lakes and their tributaries. As professed naturalists have not yet succeeded in defining the characters which distinguish the different kinds, or even in ascertaining whether these distinctions are permanent, that is, original and specific, or accidental and subject to variation, we cannot blame the mere angler for throwing so little light upon the subject. We think it likely that common loch-trout, that is, fortunate and well-fed individuals of the ordinary race, which, under happy auspices have attained to an extreme old age, will also be found of very unusual size; but we certainly have personal knowledge of several fine expansive lochs, affording first-rate feeding-ground,—such as Loch Ard and Loch Chon, where *Salmo ferox* does not occur, and where the common variety of *Salmo furio* never exceeds a few pounds in weight, and where a three or four pounder, if not a prodigy, is very rare. Now, in trolling for *Salmo ferox*, when that sort occurs, a four or five pound fish is considered rather small of its kind. The last we chanced to see and handle, were three taken in the course of an hour and a half's trolling in Loch Shin last July, by two English gentlemen from Richmond, who had never trolled for these gigantic trout before. They weighed respectively nine pounds and one ounce, six pounds and a quarter, and three pounds and a half,—or close upon nineteen pounds the three. Now, in the neigh-

* We should rejoice exceedingly to find ourselves (even in our "sear and yellow leaf,") standing by the shores of any loch in which the range of trout could be correctly characterized as varying in point of weight from one and a half to ten or twelve pounds. We never saw or heard of such before.—*Reviewer*.

bouring hill-water called Loch Craggie, where no *feroces* are ever found, but where the common trout are far finer than those of Loch Shin, being sumptuously fed, extremely strong, richly yet delicately flavoured, with pink-coloured curdy flesh, and of large average size, the adults varying from three quarters of a pound to two pounds and a half, it is extremely rare to kill one exceeding three pounds, and there is scarcely an authentic record of one of twice that weight. We doubt not, however, that in larger lochs they may occur of greater size, though it is not their tendency so to do, any more than it is the tendency of the human race to measure seven or eight feet high, although a few aspiring individuals may be steeple-form to that extent.

While at Fort-Augustus in July 1835, Mr. Stoddart saw what he considered a loch-trout of the common kind captured from a boat by trolling-tackle in Loch Ness, which weighed fourteen pounds. He states, that in point of shape it was, to his eye, symmetrically faultless, being deep in the flank, small-headed, and beautifully curved in the back and shoulder :

—"properties not always possessed by the description of trout I am alluding to, which, as overgrown individuals of their species, are inclined to show a monster front, big bony jaws, a long, straight, thick-hided hull, and huge flapping tail: in fact, all the characteristics which age, hunger, and roving habits are apt to engender."—P. 19.

We are inclined to think that river trout, although their average size is certainly less than that of the loch variety, exhibit the largest examples of their kind, if we exclude *Salmo ferax* as probably a different species. For example, Stephen Oliver the younger, records a trout taken in September 1832, near Great Driffield, which measured thirty-one inches in length, twenty-one in girth, and weighed seventeen pounds. A few years since, as mentioned by Mr. Yarrell, a notice was sent to the Linnean Society of a trout that was caught on the 11th of January 1822, in a small branch of the Avon, "at the back of Castle-street, Salisbury," which weighed twenty-five pounds, and the accurate Ichthyologist just named, has given us instances of Thames trout weighing from eleven to fifteen pounds.

"Some deep pools," says Mr. Yarrell, "in the Thames above Oxford, afford excellent trout, and some of them of very large size. I have before me a record of six, taken by minnow-spinning, which weighed together fifty-four pounds, the largest of them thirteen pounds. Few persons are aware of the difficulty of taking a trout when it has attained twelve or fourteen pounds weight, and it is very seldom that one of this size is hooked and landed, except by a first-rate fisherman; such a fish, when in good condition, is considered a present worthy a place at a royal table."*

* *British Fishes*, vol. ii. p. 56.

We believe, that the English or south country anglers are great adepts in long light casts, with delicate gear, in deep still waters, where finely deceptive fishing is required, so that a Quarterly Reviewer might possibly excel another of the North British, in that quiet though skilful mode of capturing the finny race; but in or near a roaring rock-bound river, where the stream is almost a cataract, and the pool apparently a boiling cauldron, though extremely cold, we should by no means fear to back the true Presbyterian blue against the equally true Episcopalian brown.

We have no personal knowledge of any very large river-trout in Scotland, having never killed one quite three pounds; but we see no reason to dissent from Mr. Stoddart in his statement, as to the probability of individuals, purely of the river sort, attaining to the weight of ten or twelve. In the "*Aberdeen Journal*," September 1833, mention is made of a trout killed in the Don, which weighed eleven pounds, and measured in girth seventeen inches. They are frequently captured in the Tweed by means of cairn-nets, and otherwise, weighing upwards of six pounds. Mr. Stoddart has taken them in that river, and its tributary Teviot, as heavy as four pounds and a half.* But we believe that the slow and stately streams of England, in its southern quarters, with their richer feeding-ground, and more umbrageous places of repose and shelter, produce larger trout than any that are frequent in the more translucent rivers of the north.

The rate at which trouts grow, and the time they take to at-

* There is nothing deceptive in the weight of fish, because they are just as easily weighed as flesh or feathers, the moment they are hung to a steel-yard. But there is a great deal that is extremely deceptive in the statements of anglers regarding that weight, because their judgment is warped by their imagination, and the assertion evolved is often a large fiction founded on a small fact. We were once solemnly assured by an apparently respectable Edinburgh bookseller, now no more, that he had on a certain occasion enjoyed most excellent sport near the mouth of a Highland river, where, in a few hours, he had killed fifty sea-trout, weighing a couple of pounds a-piece. Most excellent sport truly! if truly stated. We inquired if he did not find them a stiffish burden after a toilsome day, and rather troublesome perhaps to carry home if he had far to travel. He said he found them very heavy *crossing the moor*, as it was then getting dark. We should think so. Now we are free to state what we know, that no man could kill fifty sea-trout of two pounds each, without killing a good many above that weight, and a great many much below it, because sea-trout strictly two pounds in weight, don't keep company by themselves. But supposing a hundredweight of fish actually killed, no man (not even a fish-roman) could carry them home at all, whether he had to cross a moor in the dark, or keep the Queen's highway under the most radiant moon that ever cast a cloudless splendour over earth and heaven. It would require about half a dozen ordinary fishing-baskets to encase fifty sea-trout of two pounds, and three stout gillies (the captor himself being by this time far too much exhausted to lend a shoulder) to carry them home. We recommend the insertion of the statement, with many others, daily and nightly repeated by anglers of low and high degree, in the next edition of *Baron Munchausen*.

tain the adult state, are points of some importance in their history, which it is, however, fully more easy to imagine than describe. Mr. Stoddart is of opinion, that if well fed they grow with astonishing rapidity, and that under any circumstances not absolutely hostile to their existence, they acquire, in the course of four or five months, dimensions which entitle them to a "place in the angler's creel." We fear that many are placed there with very small pretensions as to size, though excellent when "lipping in numbers" in the frying-pan, with a considerable coating of meal. Their spawn is shed, like that of the salmon, during a range of several months, from the end of September onwards; and in like manner the period of hatching depends on the conditions of the weather, a mild season producing young in earlier spring than a severe one. No man can tell the age of a trout simply by looking at its teeth, and in this respect, as doubtless in many others, it differs from a horse. The following are Mr. Stoddart's views:—

"During what may be termed its infancy it requires little nourishment, and this, the quantum it requires, the most barren streams can afford; whereas, to a fish of more mature growth, such waters are quite inadequate to furnish it in the requisite sufficiency. Accordingly, in streams of this nature, trout seldom or never attain to a large size. They naturally become dwarfish and ill-conditioned, obliged as they are to subsist upon a measure of food not a whit more ample than what they had the power of obtaining, and actually did engross, without either craving or surfeit, during the first year of their existence.

"In the generality of our Scottish rivers,—for example, the Tweed and Teviot, furnishing an ample, but not an extraordinary supply of food,—the growth and age of the trout inhabiting them may be reckoned as follows. The fry, I presume, hatched in the month of April. They continue growing during the first year, as long as a regular supply of ground and surface-food is afforded them, until the latter end probably of October. By this period they have acquired a length of six or seven inches, and a corresponding weight of from two and a half to three and a half ounces. Feeding precariously during the winter, they gain no additional weight, but rather the contrary, until the spring months. About the latter end of March, the river flies making their appearance, they begin to feed regularly, and as a consequence recommence growing. By the time the supplies have again become stinted, they have acquired an accession to their length of about a couple of inches, and weigh from five to seven ounces. A considerable proportion of the trout of this the second year's growth, are in spawning trim during September, and others part with their milt a few weeks later; but a great number there are among them which do not arrive at breeding condition until the autumn and winter following. The trout of the third year's growth form the generality of those captured by the angler with fly, about the end of April and beginning of May, averaging, as they do, from seven to nine ounces

each, and occupying at that period, to the exclusion of smaller fry, (which still hold to the pools and deeper portions of the river,) the main streams and currents.

"During the first showers of March-browns, these, the trout of the third year's growth, are generally foremost on the feed, interspersed, however, with a few of their seniors—the survivors of a former generation. Of this latter description, are those approaching to, or upwards of a pound in weight—a stage of growth, on reaching which, I believe that many of our river-trout cease progressing. Others, however, which have taken up a convenient haunt or post of attack, and instinctively prefer coarse and abundant feeding, attain to a much larger size. A few individuals also, the inhabitants of the rivers I speak of, owing in the same manner, to the advantages they possess in acquiring food of a finer quality, locating themselves, for instance, under a range of alders, or at the mouth of a feeder, reach, without any loss of proportion, more than the average weight of full-grown trout. These latter subsist, almost entirely, upon ground and surface food, and only occasionally as a change, and when the other is scarce, resort to the minnow or parr."—P. 29.

There is no doubt that the size and character of trouts must depend mainly on the quantity and quality of food. There are numerous naturally impoverished streams where it is scarcely possible to capture a trout above a quarter of a pound, and the greater the number of them, the more lank and ill-conditioned they become. One might as soon expect to find jolly red-faced rollicking paupers, weighing fifteen stone and upwards, in a poor's house, as well-conditioned fish in such ill-supplied waters. It is thus that many of our Highland and northern rivers, flowing as they do through barren and uncultivated districts, with rocky unretentive beds, their waters clear and cold, containing no sedimentary deposits, and surrounded by no umbrageous banks nor varied vegetation, "the flowery lap of some irriguous valley," produce only lean and dwarfish trouts. A different rule holds in respect to salmon,—because of these the feeding grounds are in the sea, and a roaring and outrageous river is all to their taste, as food is not their object in seeking the fresh water, but a stream or *current* as an essential attribute of the spawning ground. Of course they do feed in rivers, and fortunately for ourselves, not seldom on artificial flies, (we wonder what peculiar kind they take them for,) but they do not increase in size or weight, and greatly deteriorate in general condition.

"Should the feeding ground, however," observes our author, "greatly exceed the average—I still speak in respect to quantity—although it rarely does so without the implication also of a superior quality of subsistence, trout will not only attain to a weight exceeding what I have mentioned to be that common to a full-grown Tweed

fish under ordinary circumstances, but they will arrive at it in a far shorter period of time—in the course, it may be, of two or at most three years; whereas the Tweed trout needs four to acquire its sixteen ounces, and then ceases growing. Thus in Leet or Eden, a trout of the second year's growth is as heavy as a three or even a four year old fish pastured among the channels of Tweed or Ettrick; and were the trout of these insignificant waters suffered undisturbed to reach their full size, which there is no question they would do in the course of five or six years, numbers would be found among them, as was the case not long ago, weighing severally upwards of two pounds. Thus, also, in respect to many lakes, fish-ponds, and old marl-pits, into which the fry of trouts have been put, as long as these possess a superabundance of both ground and surface-food, the young fish will thrive astonishingly, and arrive in an incredibly short space of time at dimensions exceeding those of average-sized river-trout.

“But without enlarging any further upon this subject, I shall conclude with a single observation all that is essential to be said in regard to the growth of fish; namely, that as sheep and cattle will not fatten and thrive on stinted pastures, or barren exposed moorland, so neither will the finny tribes—be the stream ever so pure and abundant—acquire size and condition unless sufficiently sheltered and amply and regularly provisioned. On the other hand, possessed of these advantages, they have all that is required in order to do them justice; while breeds or varieties of fish, hitherto pronounced shapeless and impracticable, will then, when transferred to more favoured localities, become seemly in their proportions, active in their dispositions, and relishable, if not rich-tasted, as food.”—P. 32.

All this is excellent and true, and shows the folly of those who carry Loch Leven trout, or other fine varieties, to shallow moorland swamps, without bearing in mind that it is the local characters—that is, the food and physical constitution of certain lakes and rivers, which impress co-relative characters of excellence upon their finny inhabitants, and that it is in vain to transport the one, unless you can also convey the other. But we must ourselves hasten onwards, lest the spring season overtake us, and our tackle unprepared.

Mr. Stoddart in his second chapter, expatiates on the materials of the angler's art, on gut, casting lines, knots, rods, reels, hooks, boots, pocket-books, boxes, gaffs, and panniers. But he says less than he ought to do regarding sandwiches and hard-boiled eggs. We cannot trust ourselves with the discussion at this time, either of the many points on which he enters, or the few he has omitted, but must refer our readers to the work itself. A word or two meanwhile regarding gut, and the dyeing of the same.

A man may as well go unarmed into battle, or with merely a switch in his hand, as approach a river worth wading into when

his guts are not in good order. This precious and indispensable material is fabricated from the entrails of the silk-worm, chiefly in Spain, Portugal, Italy, Sicily, and the "Isles of Greece," and almost exclusively for the British market. The Spanish is the best, either from its being constitutionally finer, or more carefully prepared. The Sicilian is of great length, but it is of a coarser fabric, and is deficient in roundness and equality of texture. Gut, to be really good, must be round and equal in the thread, not lacteous but transparent, and free from film within, or flossy fibres outside. The most desirable to possess, and therefore, as generally happens, the most difficult to obtain, is the finer kind for trout-fishing, and the stronger sort for salmon. The intermediate grades may be picked up anywhere at small expense.

In regard to the colour of gut, Mr. Stoddart is of opinion, "from experiments made by himself at various times," that it is advantageous for the angler to employ stained or dyed gut, in preference to the material in its natural state. He has ascertained also, that there are two colours, or rather tints, that take the precedence over all others in producing the desired effect; that is, concealing it from the vision of trout or salmon, as well as from the observation of the looker-on.

"With regard to the experiments in question, they were made, some at the bridge below Coldstream, and others at Teviot Bridge, near Kelso, a party on each occasion being stationed to report on the key-stone of one of the arches, and immediately superintending the cast underneath. The conclusion I have come to is; that the walnut leaf, or brown dye, is best calculated for the purpose required; although, in a bright day, and in clear water, a bluish or neutral tinge is perhaps the most desirable."—P. 40.

Now, the question here comes to be, What is "the purpose required?" Is it to deceive the trout, or only the superintendent? If the latter, it is clear that the colour which most resembles the bed of the river, if the water is shallow, or the colour of the water itself if it is deep, will prove the most deceptive; and the superintendent, if trusting to his sense of sight alone, will be truly astonished to see large trout dragged ashore by means merely of a rod and a fly, the connecting link, or at least that portion of it commonly called the gut line, having "resolved itself into a dew," through the instrumentality of walnut juice. But if the object is to deceive the *fish*, which are by no means upon the key-stone of any of the arches, but in the waters beneath, and who see the line, it may be, under various aspects, but certainly most frequently as an object above them, interposed as a slender streak between themselves and the light of heaven, then is not the question of *translucence* rather than of colour to be

kept in mind, and our decision consequently determined in favour rather of whatever intercepts least light from the eye of the fish, than of what may appear least glaring to the vision of the man? The structure of the eye in man and fish is very dissimilar, and it is perhaps not quite fair to expect the one to achieve at once what the other has long been accustomed to; but we are certainly of opinion that it was the duty of the superintendent, if he was really in earnest in his business, to demit his *super-intendence* altogether, and, descending from the key-stone of the arch, betake himself to the bed of the river, and there ascertain what aspect his variously-tinted guts assumed when he himself was under water, in his proper capacity of a sub-aqueous-intendent. He must consent to place himself in the position of a fish, or as near it as he can, before he may reasonably hope to see things as a fish sees them. As to the point in question, we presume, that as clear and colourless gut is likely to prove the most translucent and least interceptive, it is likely also to prove the most wily and least observable.

The false mode now noticed, of testing the perceptive powers of fishes by the results of our own senses, is in truth an error which pervades the very foundations of the art of angling. It lies at the bottom of all the false reasoning by which the *theory of imitation* of the natural fly is still maintained—a theory which of course supposes, in the first place, that an artificial fly is really quite like some natural one, even when the two are exhibited side by side; and not only so, but, secondly, that the same artificial fly, when diving furiously among the roaring waters, ascending against the current more frequently than it is descending with it, and crossing and re-crossing the running stream at right angles, and in all other directions with the greatest rapidity, the most perfect ease, and completest self-command, still appears to trout or salmon to be identical in kind with any poor drowning *musca*, of whatever sort, which may have fallen into the “hell of waters,” and is there instantaneously swept downwards and away for ever. Try the thing any fine day, by the side of some fair and flowing river. Pitch an actual fly of any kind into the current, and take notice whether its aspect or procedure resembles that of the artificial fly when worked by an angler who knows his trade, and is both able and willing to raise a fish. If the two objects in question do not present the same appearance, character, or mode of action, in a single feature, to the eye of any reasonable man, is it to be supposed that any fish will be found so unreasonable as to insist on detecting resemblances where none exist, and so foolish as to swallow, or attempt to swallow, an artificial fly in the afternoon, merely because it seems to it to be precisely the same as the natural insect which it had successfully swallowed

in the morning? We have far too good an opinion of fish in general to suppose any such thing.

As two sets of opinions, somewhat dissimilar if not discordant, seem still afloat upon this subject, we may here discuss them briefly, although in reality they lead rather to a theoretical than a practical difference as respects the angler.

The older, and it may be still-prevailing idea regarding artificial flies was this, that they required to be made in precise and specific imitation of certain living species, each of the many hundreds in common use exactly resembling one in nature, (it was alleged,) and that the angler's success in his art resulted from the perfection of that resemblance, the fish being so misled by it as to mistake the one for the other. Hence has arisen the expensive and multitudinous stock of flies with which many fond anglers encumber themselves, carrying hither and thither a collection like a travelling museum for extent and variety. Hence, also, that "monthly calendar," in accordance with which, as nature changes, they too must needs change their imitation of nature—all this tending to render confused and complex a subject in itself simple and unencumbered. As it is certain that fish very frequently take artificial flies, it is perhaps of less consequence what they mistake them for, the result being so far conclusive and satisfactory, that they are captured by a certain procedure, whether the theory be true or false. But that it is false we are very certain for many reasons, and this among the rest, that artificial flies—whatever their makers may intend or think—do not in truth resemble real ones at all, as we are well assured that no naturalist not an angler, if shewn a waggon-load of them, could, to save his life, tell the name of a single species they were intended to represent; and many of those most successfully used in practice, having been in the first place invented either in sheer caprice, or the intentional defiance of every principle of imitation.

There is no harm in assigning to artificial flies the names of natural insects for distinction's sake; and there is not only no harm, but a deal of good, in using them under any name whatever, so soon as we have ascertained their killing attributes at any time or place; but don't let us give an erroneous reason for our success, instead of merely being grateful for it. In a purely pictorial illustration of the subject, it is very easy to draw, engrave, and colour a real fly, and then perform the same process to an artificial one, placing the two side by side, and making the latter as like the former as we can, merely putting the end of a gut line in its mouth, and depicting a hook curving cunningly from its hinder end,—because the same materials of art are in this case applied to each, and both are merely portraits, with a

certain necessary air of resemblance. But if the artist acts conscientiously, and represents the real fly as like nature as he can; and the artificial one as like a dressed hook as he is able, then the delicate simplicity and unity of structure in the one will contrast so strongly with the strange dismantled fur-and-feather aspect of the other, that we are sure no living creature, either above or beneath the waters, will confound them. For example, in Mr. Ronalds' excellent and well-intended "*Fly-fisher's Entomology*," there is nothing at all approaching to a specific resemblance between his representations of the natural and artificial fly, as he exhibits them side by side. On the contrary, the resemblance is vague and general; and if so on paper, where both exist under the same conditions as to the materials by which they are represented, how infinitely greater must the difference be when they are compared in their actual and distinctive characters of art and nature, and composed of such dissimilar elements of form and structure.

We believe that Mr. Wilson was the first to give a distinct and systematic expression to the idea that fly-fishing ought not to be regarded exclusively as an art of imitation, and we therefore think it right to quote his views:—

"It no doubt depends on deception, which usually proceeds on the principle of one thing being successfully substituted in the likeness of another; but Bacon's distinctive definitions of simulation and dissimulation place the subject in a truer light. As simulation consists in the adoption or affectation of what is not, while dissimulation consists in the careful concealment of what really is—the one being a positive, the other rather a negative act; so the great object of the fly-fisher is to dissimulate in such a manner as to prevent his expected prey from detecting the artificial nature of his lure, without troubling himself by a vain effort to simulate or assume with his fly the appearance of any individual or specific form of insect life. There is, in truth, little or no connexion between the art of angling and the science of entomology; and therefore the success of the angler, in by far the greater proportion of cases, does not depend upon the resemblance which subsists between his artificial fly and the natural insect. This statement is no doubt greatly at variance with the expressed principles of all who have deemed fishing worthy of consideration from the days of Isaiah and Theocritus, to those of Carrol and Bainbridge. But we are not the less decidedly of opinion, that in nine cases out of ten, a fish seizes upon an artificial fly as upon an insect or moving creature *sui generis*, and not on account of its exact and successful resemblance to any accustomed and familiar object."*

The author then naturally inquires on what principle of imitative art the different kinds of salmon-fly can be supposed to

bear the most distant resemblance to any known species of natural insect? We fear he may still inquire in vain. It is certain that if, when out of the water, they in no way resemble any hitherto-discovered fly, they can never be imagined to present the likeness of one when themselves seen several inches under water, jerking up every stream and torrent "with the agility of an otter, and the strength of an alligator." As it is demonstrable that the artificial flies used for salmon bear no resemblance, either in form or colour, to any existing one, it is natural to conclude that, in this instance at least, the fish proceed upon other grounds, and are deceived by an appearance of life and motion, rather than by a specific resemblance to any thing which they had previously been in the habit of preying on. "What natural insect," Mr. Wilson asks, "do the large flies, at which sea-trout rise so readily, resemble? These, as well as grilse and salmon, frequently take the lure far within the bounds of salt-water mark; and yet naturalists know that no such thing as a salt-water fly exists, or at least has ever been discovered by their researches. Indeed, no true insect inhabits the sea."

We certainly agree with Mr. Wilson in thinking that an artificial fly can at the best be regarded only as the representative of a natural one, which has been, or is nearly, drowned, as it is impossible to imitate the dancing motion or hovering flight of the real insect over the stream; and even with this restricted idea of its resemblance to nature, the likeness must be scarcely discernible, according to the usual and most successful mode of angling, and would barely be so, even if an insane sportsman did nothing but drag his flies down the current, on purpose to make the fish believe that they were past all recovery, and could do nothing for themselves. When the far end of the line first falls upon the surface of the water, a fish may be deceived for a moment by the idea of a natural fly, (and this is one argument for light, rapid, and frequent casting,) although, if under some unbragaceous wooded bank, it may be also thinking of a winged beetle, or even wingless caterpillar; but no sooner has the practitioner begun to make his insidious *returns* upwards, downwards, or across the river, than the character and conduct of his lure assume a change, and the trout, keen-eyed—yet under the necessity of a sudden seizure, or none at all—then darts upon its prey, not as a drowning insect wafted by wind or wave, but as an agile and fugacious creature inhabiting its own element, which, in a state of inconsiderate boldness, speedily punished and put an end to, had ventured too far from the protecting shore or sedgy bank. All anglers know that the greater number, and the larger fish, are generally killed by the tail-fly, which, during the usual process of angling, swims several inches under water. That there

are determinate relations between artificial flies of certain dimensions, form, and colour, and the particular conditions of a river in respect to size and season, is very true; and in an accurate acquaintance with these relations lies the value of local experience—knowledge being power; but that they are connected, not with the necessity of representing individual forms of insect life, or any strict analogies of nature, but rather with a general principle applicable to all deceptive arts, and peculiarly so to angling, the "*ars celare artem*," is quite as true. Indeed, that angler's flies, so roughly composed as they often are, and made up of fur and feathers, with silken heads, golden ribs, worsted bodies, hair legs, and steel tails, should be looked upon as identical in aspect with any of those frail and fragile forms, instinct with life, so light and airy in their motions that they seem to glide along the glittering waters more like motes of living light than creeping things, is a belief which we really cannot take upon ourselves either to credit, or convey to others.

"Fly-fishing," observes the author last quoted, "has been compared, though by a somewhat circuitous mode of reasoning, to sculpture. It proceeds upon a few simple principles, and the theory is easily acquired, although it may require long and severe labour to become a great master in the art. Yet it is needless to encompass it with difficulties which have no existence in reality, or to render a subject intricate and confused which is in itself so plain and unencumbered. In truth, the ideas which at present prevail on the matter degrade it beneath its real dignity and importance. When Plato, speaking of painting, says, that it is merely an art of imitation, and that our pleasure arises from the truth and accuracy of the likeness, he is surely wrong; for, if it were so, where would be the superiority of the Roman and Bolognese over the Dutch and Flemish schools? So, also, in regard to fishing: the accomplished angler does not condescend to imitate specifically, and in a servile manner, the detail of things; he attends, or ought to attend, only to the great and invariable ideas which are inherent in universal nature. He throws his fly lightly and with elegance on the surface of the glittering waters, because he knows that an insect with outspread gauzy wings would so fall; but he does not imitate, (or if he does so, his practice proceeds upon an erroneous principle,) either in the air or his favourite element, the flight or the motion of particular species, because he knows that trouts are much less conversant in entomology than M. Latreille, and that their omnivorous propensities induce them, when inclined for food, to rise with equal eagerness at every minute thing which creepeth upon the earth, or swimmeth in the waters. On this fact he generalizes,—and this is the philosophy of fishing."*

We regard the mode of reasoning here adopted as fair enough,

* Ibid. p. 11.

and on the whole the facts seem in favour of the philosophers, if we may be allowed to call them so ; but as others are not of that opinion, we must listen to them also, on the just principle of "*Audi alteram partem.*" For example, the author of the "*Hand-Book of Angling,*" who rejoices in the fleeting name of *Ephemera*, adheres to the old doctrine, and thinks flies flies. We are sorry for him, but cannot help it.

"Of late years," he observes, "a new doctrine—in my opinion, a totally wrong one—has been sent forth about artificial flies. Some Scotch writers were the first promulgators of it, and they have carried it to ridiculous extravagance. They positively maintain that there is no likeness between the natural fly and the artificial one, and that, when natural flies are on the water, the angler will be more successful by using artificial flies as widely different from them in shape, colour, &c., as may be. [The philosophers have never *gravely* gone this length.] A nondescript artificial fly will succeed better, they say, than a bad resemblance, and every attempt at imitation, in their opinion, produces at the best but a bad resemblance. These angling heretics contend that fish, rising at a natural fly, immediately detect—by comparison, of course—the bad imitation, and refuse to rise at it ; whereas they will rise at some outlandish artificial that differs, more than chalk does from Cheshire cheese, from the living fly on the water. They say, that when they go fly-fishing they catch some of those flies that are on the water, and fish with artificial flies totally different from them, and invariably meet with more success than if they used so-called—as they name them—imitations. The majority of mankind are mad on one subject or another. Perhaps the majority of animals are equally so. These mad fly-fishers are successful, no doubt, because they meet with mad fish, which are more readily taken with fantastic flies than with naturally coloured and shaped ones. That is the only way I can account for their heterodoxy. My friends, do not mind what these cracked sectarians say."—P. 48.

This is certainly a pleasant, easy, tooth-pick style of writing, although we do not venture to recommend its adoption by others, because, according to the theory to which we now incline, imitation is difficult, if not dangerous. He then proceeds to say, that in the month of October 1846, a young relative of his own sent him a fly that had alighted on his paper, when he was sketching out of doors. He (the youthful relation) wanted to know its name :—

"When the fly arrived, some boyish anglers were with me, and I told them to find amongst my artificial flies any one that they thought resembled the natural one in shape and colour. Without more than necessary delay, and at the first guess, they picked out the right imitation. I then told them to look for the same fly in Alfred Ronalds' '*Fly-fisher's Entomology.*' They did so ; found the *drawing* and the imitation, and pronounced the natural fly 'the gold-eyed gauze-

wing.' They were right; and if boyish eyes, looking through nature's microscope, were right, think you fish would be wrong? •

"Now, this fly of which I am speaking, has a green body, with a slight yellow cast in it, four transparent reticulated wings, lying flat over the body, the two under wings being shorter than the upper, and these latter longer than the body of the fly. The head and eyes appear brightly burnished. You have seen an imitation cigar with its burning end, deceive the most knowing *connoisseur*. You have seen a glass filled with simulated brandy and water, invitingly undulating, as it was offered to a most accomplished judge, and taken by him unconscious, until no smell or taste told him of the deception. You have seen man deceived by imitations, with his fine eye for shape and colour—and yet the philosophers tell you fish cannot be so deceived." —P. 50.

This is not only fine writing, but approaches powerful painting. It certainly exhibits several good groups, well fitted to afford subjects for a series of rather striking pictures of domestic life. "Artifice detected, or *Heemerobius* himself again," would delight the angler and entomologist; "The burning of Havanah, or the smokeless smoker," would hold out a model to young men, whose maiden aunts mourn over the deteriorated smell of the rising generation; while "The accomplished Judge done brown," would shew, that the wisest as well as the weakest of mankind should never trust to mere appearances, and are often deceived thereby.

The insect above referred to, is *Heemerobius perla* of naturalists; a creature beautiful exceedingly, with delicate lace-like wings, a head and body of pale and ghostly green, and eyes lustrous as balls of living fire. It flies about in calm summer evenings, with wings broadly expanded, but of feeble force, owing to the extreme delicacy of their texture, and deficiency of muscular power; and hence it never stirs abroad in windy weather. It does not affect the river-side, but is rather a sylvan species, being found along the outskirts of woods, and in well-sheltered fields, and shrub-encircled gardens, laying its eggs, remarkable for the stalk-like elongations by which they are supported, on the leaves of lime trees. The instant it touches water with its ample wings, and very feeble thorax, it falls flat, helpless, paralysed, upon the surface, as if deprived of every power of locomotion. We should like to see *Ephemera*'s imitation of this species, which led to the discovery of its kind; but if it no more resembles the real one, than does Mr. Ronalds' drawing of the artificial insect, then the "young relative" must indeed have been a sharp-sighted youth. Its body, we are told, is to be formed of "very pale green floss silk, tied on with silk thread of the same colour," while the wings and legs, both of which are yellowish green in nature, are to be com-

posed in art of "the palest *blue dun* hackle which can be procured." Ephemera no doubt improves the imitation of the organs of flight, by substituting the fibres of a young starling's wing-feather stained green,—but then for the head, shining like a small though most effulgent light-house, he recommends "two or three laps of bright *brown* silk!" and all this in the way of a precise and specific imitation, not of a winged insect in general, but of *Heemerobius perla* in particular. We wonder how it works upon the water, and how like, after a minute's immersion, may be the pale green floss, bright brown silk, and stained fibre of the starling's wing, all dodging away diligently as one united and harmonious fly, to the fair and frail original, lying outspread upon the liquid surface in pearly though unconscious lustre. There is no manner of doubt that the trout will first swallow the real insect, and then attempt to swallow the artificial one, which, however, it will be debarred from doing by Ephemera himself, (who we are sure is an excellent angler in practice, though on the point in question theoretically wrong,) instantly striking the unexpected barb into its cheek or tongue, and landing it in less than no time. But this voracity on the part of the trout, however inexcusable, is in no way unaccountable. It merely prefers two morsels to one, however dissimilar these may be; and no person can (or at least ought to) suppose that it mistakes "the laps of brown silk" and other "furnishings," for the resplendent visage of the "gold-eyed gauze-wing." No sensible (if hungry) man refuses mutton-chops because he cannot conscientiously conceive them to be veal-cutlets. He will probably help himself to both, if placed within his reach, and if one or other should turn out to be not quite what he expected, he will no doubt upbraid the waiter, who will merely put his tongue in his cheek. Let him be thankful that he has not a hook in his own.

We fear from the concluding lines of the last quoted paragraph, "and yet the philosophers tell you fish cannot be so deceived," that Ephemera really does not understand the question, after all. Not only do "the philosophers" tell us fish can be so deceived, but they inform us, that they are much more easily deceived than the disciples of the other school are aware of. Because the said philosophers, while admitting that fish are caught, and even asserting that they catch them now and then themselves, merely deny that artificial flies *specifically* resemble real ones, and so they all the more admit that trout are easily deceived by imitations of the most abominable, absurd, and outrageous nature, that it is possible for the mind of man to conceive, or his hands to execute.

According to Ephemera, birds are constantly deceived by "*the*

artificial fly." We have killed but few fowls of the air with rod and line, but we doubt not the thing is possible.

"Swallows, martins, swifts, goldfinches, have darted at artificial flies, as the wind flew them about on the line, and have hooked themselves and been taken. It was only last year, that a dunghill cock [he should have had his hackles pulled,] seized an artificial May-fly attached to an angler's rod, resting outside an inn at Buxton, and was caught. If birds take these imitations of water-flies, not being their natural or best food, how can it be argued that fish will not take them."—P. 52.

Certainly the argument will not be maintained by any man who fills his fishing-basket, or any portion of the same, however stubbornly he may insist that neither cocks nor hens take them because they exactly resemble their old friend *Hemerobius perlæ*, or any other flying thing.

"The philosophers say, attempts at imitation are of no avail, for salmon and some of the salmonidæ rise eagerly at artificial flies that resemble nothing living on earth, in air, or water. *That is true, and as yet unaccountable.* But dress those gaudy salmon-flies, or lake trout-flies, as small as you like, and the common trout and grayling will not rise at them."—P. 52.

With grayling, as it is not a Scotch fish, we have nothing now to do; but this we know, that with small salmon-flies, we have killed scores of common trout, and it is indeed our usual practice in grilse fishing, to angle not only the strong runs, and deeper waters where these fish lie, but also all the shallower pools and streams, as we pass along, for trout; and the last day we tried the Inver, on the west coast of Sutherland, although we killed only a couple of grilse, we captured eighteen excellent river-trout with the same fly. A day or two subsequently, while angling along a certain rocky range of shore at the head of Loch Assynt, in the hope of grilse, and with a grilse-fly as the drag, and a loch-fly as dropper, we killed a fine fresh-run grilse with the latter, and the majority of twenty-seven loch-trout with the former. We firmly believe Ephemera would have made a better day's work of it, either with his own flies, or any other person's.

"The artificial May-fly is not a killing bait except under peculiar circumstances, and when thrown upon the water amongst the real flies, fish will generally prefer the latter. Use any other artificial fly, as unlike the May-fly as possible, and you will prove the theory of the philosophers to be erroneous, for fish will not rise at these unlike flies at all."—P. 53.

It is curious that we happened inadvertently to disprove the truth of this assertion before we knew it had been made. While

fishing Loch Craggie, near Lairg, last June, the May-fly, commonly so called, was still upon the water, as it is a cold though kind country thereabouts, and the shores of the Loch, in consequence of a heavy and continuous shower of hail, were on the 22d of that month for an hour or two as white as Nova Zembla. But on one of our more genial and successful days, when a gentle rippling breeze was bringing the natural insects from a small scantling of silvery-stemmed birch-trees—the only wood in view—and we were floating our small craft down the Loch, we espied before us a pair of May-flies on the water, holding their wings erect and high, as if proud of their newly acquired though by no means safe position. In the indulgence of our own caprice, though with no desire to rival nature, far less eclipse that beautiful abstraction, we threw our cast of flies, all three fanciful, and two of them our own invention, beyond the “naturals,” and then brought our line homewards, and between them, a little under water. Just as our own lures intercepted the loving pair, there was perceived a heavy gurgling bulge upon the surface, and old George Munro, keeper of Loch Craggie, who was working the boat as smoothly as in oil, said softly in Celtic Saxon, “She’s like a grulsh.” We knew it; and striking her fondly but firmly, after a few minutes’ dalliance brought her first into the landing-net, and then into the boat, where she lay in such mild yet radiant freshness, that no mention could be made of pearls. *She* was of course not a grilse, (which having no wings, cannot attain Loch Craggie,) and had never been to sea; but had nevertheless swallowed a huge sea-trout lure, resplendent with blue wings, a red body, a golden cincture, and a crimson tail, a thing, or rather combination of things, altogether more nearly resembling a footman than a fly, and the likeness of which assuredly was never seen alive on all the earth.

“The above famous May-fly,” continues the persevering Ephemera, “so common in the rivers of the Midland, the Western, and the Southern Counties of England, is not so common in the north, is rare and even unknown in many of the best rivers of Scotland, Ireland, and Wales. It would be in vain to fish with it there, which proves again that the common trout at any rate will not rise at nondescript things, which instinct informs them have no resemblance to their natural food.”—P. 55.

A creature not previously seen in some particular locality, is not necessarily a nondescript. For many a long year we never met with either a bear or a Bengal tiger in any portion of the Scottish Highlands, and yet we did not consider them as nondescripts, for we had ourselves described them on several occasions with considerable accuracy; and when, during one still summer morning, while walking silently and in solitude, as is our wont,

through the sombre pass of Killierankie, our astonished vision was dazzled by encountering team after team of richly-harnessed horses, six or eight pair to many a sumptuous carriage, all bright and burnished even like the golden chariots of the sun, with stately serving-men abreast on either side—what did we chance to see? Not one, but many tigers,—the panther of the wilderness, with changeless spots,—the broad fronted lion, shaking the dew-drops from his shaggy main, (not such as fell of old on Clavers' bloody field,)—the elephant, wisest of beasts, with slow and solemn steps,—and camelopard, "tall as the mast of some huge ammiral," o'ertopping the young trees. These were by no means nondescripts, though erst unseen in Perthshire's woodland glades, but merely the subdued and money-making subjects of the "Lion King," Carter or Van Amburgh, we know not which, who was making his way between Blair-Atholl and Dunkeld, and onwards to Dundee. But this is a digression.

Supposing, however, that the May-fly is unknown in Scotland, and that being so, its imitation is a nondescript with which "it would be in vain to fish there," we can prove that in this case all is not vanity under the sun. We have no special fancy for the so-called May-fly, but we never used it in Scotland, either in loch or river, without finding it acquit itself very fairly in each. We may relieve Ephemera's mind, however, by informing him frankly, that the natural fly is abundant in Scotland, and that the Scotch trouts, though, like the English ones, they "generally prefer the real flies," especially for a continuance, will take them also in the artificial state, in spite of our calling them May-flies, but certainly not in consequence of their thinking that they are so.*

As we have stated our opinion that the majority of artificial flies do not in truth at all resemble real ones, and that many of the most fanciful and far from nature, are among the most successfully deceptive in art, we of course do not maintain the necessity of perfect, or even approximate imitation, which is so far fortunate, as we at the same time deny its possibility. But as

* We have ourselves invented some of the best loch-trout flies now in use, although we don't desire to dwell much on that matter. It is a good if not a great thing to be modest as well as meritorious; but we cannot refrain from here alluding to our latest, and not least ingenious application of science to art, in the way of a ground-bait. This consists of a small pellet, used like salmon roe, with which it may be intermingled, and made of *chloroform* paste. We name it "Simpson's Persuader," in honour of an Edinburgh Professor, who has successfully introduced the use of chloroform into other arts than those of angling. A trout no sooner takes one of these pellets into its mouth than it falls into a sweet sleep, and may be instantly drawn ashore, and put to death without its knowing any thing more about it. We expect a first-class medal from the "Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals," and surely deserve it far more than do long-winded wearisome clergymen their £10 a-piece, for inflicting on their fellow-creatures the annual Gibsonian sermon on the subject.

Ephemera is of a totally different opinion, we shall conclude this portion of our subject by the following passage from the "Hand-Book," after which we don't think much more need be said on either side. After referring to the advantages to be derived from the study of Mr. Ronalds' "Fly-fisher's Entomology," and Mr. Blacker's "Art of Fly-making," the author proceeds—

"Still we are not perfect in fly-making, nor shall we be so until some more pains-taking fly-dresser gets a collection of natural flies, examines them by means of the microscope, ascertains their precise colour and anatomy, and then by microscopic examinations again of feathers, mohair, fur, and so forth, arrives at the exact imitative materials. When that is done, fly-fishing will be reduced to a sporting science exceedingly amusive and instructive. The young man or woman fly-dresser, at present is merely acquainted with the mechanical part of the art, dresses from artificial specimens, knows little or nothing of the natural insect, and is rarely a good angler. They are copyists, and do not know whether that which they have to copy is a good likeness of the living subject or not. A fishing-tackle maker, to be a great and good one, should have an insect museum—each fly, caterpillar, or beetle, preserved in cases, named and numbered, and its season noted. From these models he should dress his flies; and when he finds he has succeeded in framing perfect copies, he should note down the materials he has used in their formation, and then he will have sure guides for the fly-dressers he employs. He should pay those persons well, and engage none who do not deserve high pay; and should charge his customers a remunerative price. The generality of flies are sold at too low a price. They cannot be made well at a low price; they must be defective in every way, and hence the purchaser meets with little success, much loss of time and of money, for cheap things are always the most expensive in the end."—P. 70.

The labourer is worthy of his hire—and we heartily wish each great and good fishing-tackle maker all success; may he have better pay, and never prick his fingers. But it is rather fearful to look forward to the result of such intense study of nature and of nature's works, under laborious microscopical investigations. Why, the world of waters will be covered with cunning Frankensteins, able and willing to give such life and motion to dead matter, that the very fish will be no less delighted than deceived. When the poor student, supping his cocky-leekie, discovered, when it was rather late, that he had swallowed a large black slug instead of a prune, his only observation was, "That will teach thee not to look so like a plum-damas." We have no doubt that when Ephemera's flies are formed and finished off after the *super-natural* fashion above anticipated, they will be most amazingly run after under water; and that, in fact, it will be only by sheer inadvertence that a trout will condescend now

and then to take a particularly pleasant-looking real unbarbed insect, and when he finds it go more smoothly down his throat than he expected, he may then gurgle in his gills, "that will teach thee not to look so like a *fly*."

It would seem, then, that the followers of the piscatorial art are at present divisible into two great schools or shoals—we shall not call them factions—the philosophers (*φίλος σοφία*) or lovers of wisdom, and the ephemerals (*Εφήμερος*) or creatures of a day; and although we think that there is a good deal in this world that is falsely philosophical, as well as a great deal that is truly ephemeral, we confess that in relation to the present vexed question, (and we are sorry to have vexed it,) we take our side with the former on what we think a fixed foundation, rather than with the latter on one unstable as the element *in* which they stand. We shall now return to Mr. Stoddart.

Our impression at one time was, that this skilful practitioner, in respect to the theoretical views above expounded, took up a kind of intermediate position, like those politicians, rather wily than wise, who don't attend Tory meetings and won't go to Whig ones. But we did him injustice, and have come to the conclusion that he is quite upon the sound side. Even in his earliest work, the "Scottish Angler," we find as follows:—

"A great deal has been offered upon this matter by various writers, which we deem absurd and unnecessary. Trout are no doubt nice and capricious feeders; but any pretensions in anglers to classify and distinguish their favourite flies, according to the month, are totally without reason. The colours of water and sky are the only indicators which can lead us to select the most killing hook, and even these are often deceptive. We have fished in one stream of a river when dark, and in the next when red flies took the lead. There is no trusting to the fancy in certain places. On Tweed, we have seen it veer about, like the wind, in one moment, without a note of preparation. Most rivers, however, are more steady; and when the water is of a moderate size, may be relied on with at most two sorts of flies all the year round. For ourselves, our maximum in every Scottish stream is reduced to only four descriptions of artificial flies, with one or other of which we engage to catch trout over all the kingdom. Knowledge and practice have convinced us of the needlessness of storing up endless and perplexing varieties, which some do, to look knowing and scientific."—P. 25.

In his recent work, our author speaks out still more plainly:—

"In the preceding chapter I have sufficiently exposed to view my theory respecting the artificial fly, disclaiming the common notion, that it is quite imperative to construct it after a fixed, natural model, to adapt it to hours and seasons, or, except in the matter of size, to

extend the variety beyond a very limited and clearly-defined range."—P. 98.

He elsewhere remarks, how tantalizing it is, while angling, to be approached, almost within a rod's length, by numbers of feeding trout, and yet find oneself unable to secure even half a dozen of the smallest.

"How, then," he asks, "is this to be obviated? Fully and sufficiently it cannot; but in a certain measure, I have reason to think, it may, and that by the adoption of a different size and species of fly from the one *astir*. Instead, for instance, of an artificial March-brown, let the angler use a dark-coloured hackle or hare-lug, dressed upon No. 4 Kendal wire."—P. 87.

When alluding to night-fishing during sultry weather in June and July, he observes, that it is not necessary that the fly should have "any definite colour, or that it be made, as many suppose, to resemble a small moth. I have found black, brown, and hare-lug flies equally as effective as white and yellow ones."—P. 90. And when referring to the black and brown hackles, as forming, in his opinion, along with the hare-lug, the three foundational or essential flies, he adds as follows:—

"It cannot be denied, that in the case of the hackle-fly, the wing, tinsel, and dubbing, whether of silk or wool, possess, on many occasions, an attractive influence over trout; nay, even a combination of these without hackle at all, may constitute a taking lure; but what is proved by all this, but that fish are allured, not on account of the close resemblance which the artificial hook is designed to have to particular insects, appropriate to particular months and seasons, but from other causes of a different nature. These are size, motion, form, and colour; the latter qualification being the one upon which, by introducing certain well-trying standards, my classification, as regards the artificial fly, has been conducted."—P. 93.

Mr. Stoddart, therefore, now derides, and justly, the absurdities of those who, exulting in the possession of five or six dozen varieties of insect imitations, consume the prime portion of the day in testing their attractive powers, now unlooping one because it is too dark, then another because it is too light, and "attaching in turn the latest urban conceit, redoubted as a killer, the fail-me-never of some sporting parson or half-pay hero."

"What, I naturally ask," he continues, "are the notions of such anglers with respect to the tastes, or, it may be, the optics of the trout? Do they suppose this fish, in regard to its surface food, so singularly capricious as to refuse all others but the insect of the day—so whimsical, as even to resist the claims of hunger itself, unless wrought on by the appearance of some peculiarly streaked water-fly?

Do they fancy it discriminative of every shade or hue in the wing, body, and feelers of its prey?

"The experience of twenty years and upwards has led to the conviction, on my part, that a stock consisting of three, or at most four, diversities of trouting flies, is quite sufficient to insure success at all seasons on any of our lakes and streams. I am talking of diversities, and, in doing so, allude to the colour, shape, and material of the imitation employed—not at all to its size; *that* I leave to be wholly regulated by circumstances, such, for instance, as the season of the year, the low or flooded state of the water, calms or winds, &c.

"The fly-stock of the trout-fisher may then, I opine, in point of colour, be restricted, without detriment, to the following varieties:—

- "1. The red or brown hackle, with or without wings.
- "2. The black hackle, Do. do.*
- "3. The hare-lug or water-mouse body, with wings.

"These, as noted down, are essentially the ground-work of a killing fly-stock. They are the elements most requisite in the construction of those lures, which pedant authors on angling have chosen to dignify with entomological names, and by the addition as well as substitution of other materials, increase and vary to such a degree, that all count of what really is a taking and trustworthy fly is overwhelmed in their teeming and bulky store page."—P. 77-8.†

Pass we the chapters "on worm-fishing for trout;" "on trouting with minnow, and parr-tail;" on "angling with the sal-

* In regard to the above alternative of "with or without wings," we should say decidedly, in almost all cases, *with* wings. The so-called spider-flies, Palmers and other *apterous* species, do very well while under the influence of motion, but when they come to a stand still, as they must often do, especially when the angler is fishing with a long line in quiet waters, they assume a very lifeless inorganic aspect, as if they were merely small incipient bottle-brushes, or tufts of dingy thistle down. But a neat, compact, somewhat slender pair of wings, look well when travelling through the water, and give, moreover, during momentary pauses, a steady and substantial aspect, like that of a fly well to do in the world, and therefore worth victimizing. We have more than once seen a trout pursue a wingless tail-fly from the side of a stream into still water, when, motion having ceased, it detected the feathery disarray, and passing onwards, engulfed one of the droppers equally in a state of rest, but more substantially dressed, and *winged*.

† In the "Scottish Angler," Mr. S. had previously stated, that "foremost is the fly commonly called the Professor, after Professor Wilson of Edinburgh. The wings are formed of a mottled brown feather, taken from the Mallard or wild drake; the body is of yellow floss silk, rather longish, [the body, not the silk, which is trig and tightly wimpled,] and wound about close to the head with a fine red or black hackle; tails are often used, but we think them unnecessary. Instead of a yellow silk body, we sometimes adopt one of pale green, especially in loch fishing."—P. 25. In the "Angler's Companion," the author gives rather less prominence to the Professor than his unabated powers deserve. We used him much and most advantageously last season; and in Loch Craggie, and other northern quarters, found him when of good size, and dressed with the coils of red hackle coming well on to the forepart of the chest, a more killing lure than his darker and more bulky bodied companion, "Green Mantle." Having a great admiration, in common with the rest of the reading and reel-using public, for both the actual and the artificial Professor, we take this opportunity to state, that in respect to each the feeling referred to is rather increased than diminished.

mon roe;”—and let us approach with respect bordering upon awe, chapter 9,—“THE SALMON.”

We shall not inflict upon our readers what ought by this time to be to them the well-known history of this princely species. Is it not recorded in the books of Shaw and Young? But is it not mis-stated in the book of Thomas Tod Stoddart? Somewhat we opine, and shall ere long proceed to prove.* In the meantime, let us consider briefly the subject of angling for salmon, as discussed by Mr. Scrope, the said T. T. Stoddart, and other worthies.

A rod which is characterized by length and strength, of course enables the piscator to effect a far cast, and this is of advantage in deep and broad rivers, where wading, if not dangerous is at least inadvisable. On the other hand, the additional fatigue of wielding a heavy rod must be considered in a long day's work, as the muscular action of the back and arms is not inexhaustible, and a sense of pain and weariness does not add either to the pleasure or productiveness of sport. No doubt

“The labour we delight in physics pain;”

but when a rod of sixteen or eighteen feet gives a reasonable command of a river, it is well to be satisfied with that extent. The great use of a long rod, is not only to afford a far cast with a heavy line, but to enable the angler to hold that line well up out of the way of projecting rocks or stones, when the fish makes a long and rapid run over a rough country, and cannot be kept up with in consequence of the broken nature of the ground. You also weary him out all the sooner by the additional weight which may be brought to bear upon him by firm holding, by “giving the butt” as the backward position of the rod is called, without endangering the tackle. But with a slight or single-handed implement (we have frequently killed *fish*,† from ten to fourteen pounds weight, with a rather delicately constructed trout-rod, which measures only thirteen feet four inches,) greater caution and a few minutes more time are needed; and it may happen that during these few minutes the slim portion of skin or tendon, by which the prey is held, if slightly hooked, gives way, and although the line is lightened, the angler's heart becomes heavy with hope de-

* The exposition above referred to, of what we conceive to be Mr. Stoddart's erroneous views regarding the production of salmon, and the growth of parr, is already written, and formed in fact a portion of the present article, the length of which, however, it so unduly extended, as to make the insertion of the whole at once inconsistent with other editorial arrangements. We have, therefore, reserved certain critical inquiries connected with the physiological and natural history of salmon, until next Number.

† In anglers' phraseology, the term *fish* is only applied to grilse and salmon, and never to fresh-water trout, however large and resplendent these may be.

ferred. So as delays are dangerous, the quicker a salmon can be killed the better. At the same time we admit that Captain —— is an excellent and successful angler, and he always uses a single-handed rod,—but then his chief reason for so doing is not of a guiding nature to others, but rather personal to himself, as he served throughout the peninsular war, and came home with only one arm.

The length of the line should also be in some measure regulated by that of the river, although ten or twenty yards, more or less, make little difference in the weight of the tackle, and it is well to be provided for a *run*, although fish don't go so far as foxes. From ninety to a hundred and thirty yards, probably include the utmost that may be required, as well as the least that it is safe to trust to. It should taper for a few yards at the extremity, which makes the casting portion somewhat lighter, and produces a more delicate gradation towards the gut-line. But it should surely not be "thick in the middle, and taper towards each end," as *Ephemera* hath it, as this would cause additional weakness, in proportion as the line was well run-out.

Of the colour of gut we have already spoken. As to its being used single or double, that must depend upon its quality. First-rate single gut is sufficient, with skill and carefulness, to kill a salmon to its heart's content; but we think the *gradation* just referred to, makes it rather advisable to have at least the upper portion double for a few links adjoining the reel-line. If the river is rough and rocky, and genuine salmon-gut of prime quality cannot be had, then the entire casting-line should be double.

In regard to the choice of flies, the first thing is to endeavour to forget that there is such a thing as a natural fly on the face of the earth. You may then, by assiduous and observant practice on your own part, conjoined with reasonable though not too pertinacious inquiry from others who are locally experienced, obtain a knowledge of the artificial kinds. That some flies are better than others there is no doubt, but it is extremely difficult to say before-hand, which may prove the most successful, so variable are the fancies of salmon, and apparently so regulated by the state of the river, of the weather, or of other things it may be of an atmospheric nature—unappreciable by our less delicate perceptions.

"When a man toils a long time without success," says Mr. Scrope, "he is apt to attribute his failure to the using an improper fly, so he changes his book through, till at last, perhaps, he catches fish. The fly with which he achieves this, is naturally a favourite ever afterwards, and probably without reason: the cause of success might be in the change of air and temperature of the water; and the same

thing would probably have occurred if he had persevered with the same fly with which he began. When the night has been frosty, salmon will not stir till the water has received the genial warmth of the day; and there are a thousand hidden causes of obstruction, of which we, who are not fish, know nothing.

"As an instance, I once fished over a short stream above 'The Webbs,' in Mertoun Water, without having an offer. Being convinced there were fish in it, I went over it a second time with *the same fly* immediately afterwards, and caught two salmon and two grilse. Now, if I had changed my fly, as is usual, the success would naturally have been attributed to such change. But observe, I do not mean to assert that all flies are equally successful, for there must obviously be a preference, however slight; but I mean merely to say, that a failure oftener occurs from atmospheric variations than from colour of the fly. Yet an occasional change is always advisable, particularly if you have had any offers; since the fish, in so rising, having perhaps discovered the deception, will not be solicitous to renew their acquaintance with a detected scamp. *After all, the great thing is to give the appearance and motion of a living animal.*"*

This is all as true as steel. The italics are our own, as we love the sentiment, which we had expressed almost in the very same words long before we had seen Mr. Scrope's work, and when we were as ignorant of his ideas as he of ours.

Another person's fly sometimes proves more successful than the angler's own—at least we found it so the last day save one on which we fished the famous river Shin. We had left Lairg at five o'clock of a fine grey July morning, and the dog-cart took us four miles down the river in a few minutes, as we wished to angle the lower pools between the waterfall and Shin Bridge. It was Monday—the best day in the week for sport in that quarter, as net and cobble are at rest at the river's mouth throughout the preceding day, and so an extra number of fresh-run fish have generally made their way upwards into stream and pool. We thought the day our own, as we knew of no one on the water (with permission) except ourselves, and so we descended to the river-side, and took our station by a well-known rush of water. Just as we commenced casting into the neck of the stream, we perceived that we had been anticipated, even at that early hour, for there stood at the tail of it a tall stranger, clad in tweeds from top to toe, whom we had actually seen a few minutes before, but had taken for an aspiring crag, so like was his pervading colour to the rocky cincture of that roaring river. It was

* *Days and Nights of Salmon Fishing in the Tweed.* By William Scrope, Esq. P. 123. Neither the reader in general, nor the angler in particular, whether for amusement or information, can consult a better work than the beautiful one now named.

by mere chance that we had not stepped in before rather than behind him, which would not have accorded with piscatorial politeness. We fished the stream more quickly and carelessly than we should else have done; and as the "great unknown" passed downwards we did so too, in the hope of picking up what he might leave. We happened to have our eye upon him when he commenced the next stretch, which he had no sooner done than he raised a fine fish that came at him like a great wedge of blue and silver, making itself distinctly heard even amid the voice of many waters, for the banks were now high, rocky, and resounding from afar. However, it appeared that he had either missed his fish, or his fish had missed him, for no direct communication had been established between them. The angler then paused a minute—whether wisely or no we cannot take upon ourselves to say—but pause he did, drew up his line, took off his fly, unfolded his capacious pocket-book, appended to his line another lure, and tried the cast again. But this time he essayed in vain, for salmo, taking the sulks, had sunk beneath the darkening waters, and the turbulent stream pursued its course, unbroken but by its own uproarious nature, and its rocky shores. The piscator passed again downwards, and we also descending, came upon the spot which he had left. With one leg planted in the water, and another on a ledge of protruding rock, we were just about to try our chance, when we espied beneath our upraised foot, just as we were setting it for firmness sake on the aforesaid ledge, a beautiful and highly finished Irish fly, really a splendid piece of work, elaborate with the fantastic feathering of guinea-fowl, golden-pheasant, king-fisher, blue and buff maccaw, and other "birds of gayest plume." It had dropped unwittingly from the fingers of our aspiring predecessor, and was, we presumed, the very lure at which the salmon had just made so bright a lounge, and which its ungrateful inconsiderate master had suddenly discarded and deposed, as if the fly had been to blame. We considered within ourselves, that if the fish had risen once so keenly, in like manner it might rise again, and so taking off our own property, we substituted the piece of "treasure trove," and cast it on the waters. Truly we found it again ere many minutes, for scarcely had it hung a few seconds pretty well within the edge of the off-side of the stream, than up rose salmo like an aurora-borealis, and away he went down the water, with a fly in his mouth which was certainly neither his nor ours. However, we gave him line liberally, (*it was our own*), and strode along the rocks as fast as we were able. He went at once down to the tail of his own stream, stopped, turned, gave a surly indefinite kind of plunge, as if he were both fish and fowl, but instead of returning upwards as we expected, he had merely made a somer-

set under water, and then went away down again, like a congreve rocket, through a narrow rush of water between two rocks, and into a dark and deep capacious pool below. This was precisely what he ought to have done, for we knew this bit of water as well as he did, or rather better, as we had been always near, and often in it, for a fortnight; whereas not being a member of the Sabbath Alliance, he had come up the day before. Time and types are wanting to tell all he did, (we say nothing of ourselves,) but after working him steadily for about sixteen minutes, he began to *wamble* through the water, and to show rather that his sides were deep and silvery, than that his back was broad and blue. We ere long led him gently into quiet water, towards the central side of that capacious pool, where our predecessor was still standing in his tweeds; and at the feet of that predecessor, our sagacious friend and follower, "the miller," gaffed and laid him down—a beautiful fish which might have been the stranger's own, and with a fly in his mouth, which assuredly had been so. He kindly informed us of what we were previously well aware, that he had raised that same salmon himself not half an hour before, and requested leave to look at our fly. When we shewed it, none the worse for wear, he looked at it reproachfully, and declared it was a perfect fac-simile of the one with which he had so nearly struck the fish himself, and which was then in his pocket-book. The first clause of the verse was very true—it was really as like as possible; the second was perhaps open to some cavilling objection, but as we are not ourselves of an argumentative turn of mind, we said nothing more upon the subject.

The mode of casting and working the fly can only be attained by practical experience, often dearly bought. Mr. Stoddart says well—

"never allow the hook itself to plough or ruffle the surface of the water. By the trout-fisher, whose lures are in point of size comparatively insignificant, this may be done occasionally without any bad result; but a salmon-fly thus worked will generally occasion distrust or terror, and seldom prove inviting."

Salmon-angling is a much more slow and solemn occupation than trouting. Although a *fish* will sometimes take the fly upon the very surface, and almost the moment it arrives there, it more frequently *waits for it* under water, and after it has been allowed to course some portion of the stream. Deep and slow fishing is certainly more advisable than a superficial hasty style, although both extremes are bad. Although a salmon when sharp-set will no doubt follow a fly, and so go somewhat out of his way to obtain it, yet on the whole he prefers its being put honestly before

him, which can only be done designedly when his own special haunt is known. But there is generally what may be called a likely portion of the water, and there the fly should take its patient and insidious courses—sometimes a solemn semi-circular sweep—then a coy attempt to escape by gently jousting upwards—while ever and anon it should hang as if enamoured in the stream, or even be dropt suddenly a foot or two downwards, and then recovered cautiously again. These and many more manœuvres must be called forth and regulated by the particular nature of the “pure element of waters” in which the angler may be standing for the time—an onward or at least continuous movement being advisable in the comparatively still reaches of a river, while the dallying or hovering action suits the more rapid and perturbed streams. On the whole, the upward or longitudinal motion, more or less varied, seems more successful, if not more deceptive, than the transverse. A river is seldom as broad as it is long; and if a salmon sees a nice-looking artificial fly (we never saw them rise at a real one) it will prefer following it up the deeper channel of the stream or current, to turning shorewards for it, with the risk of finding itself in shallow water, and wasting its silver sheen upon the gravel. That the hovering or hanging system is a good one, we had a couple of years ago occasion to exemplify, as follows. The reader will again excuse a “personal narrative,” though not by Humboldt.

We were angling on the river Inver with two friends, and had taken up our own position on the cruive-dyke which crosses that river about a mile and a half above Loch Inver. The principal stream was running impetuously beneath our feet, as we had commenced casting, for the sake of firm and comfortable footing, from off the boards which formed the roof of the cruive itself. We could thus command not only the centre of the current, but both its sides. However, we threw away for some time without raising a fish. Our two companions had taken up their station somewhat lower down, and were casting from the leftward shore. From their position, and working, as they were obliged to do, at right angles to the stream, although they could put their flies well into the nearer side of the current of strong water, they could not *hang* them there, because before that process can be effected, the line must fall away downwards till it is nearly at right angles with the rod, at least if the angler is casting across the water. The centre of that lower portion of the stream looked very inviting, but as it was beyond our own reach by ordinary casting, and besides, by courtesy, belonged for the time being rather to our friends than ourselves, we indulged in no covetous designs regarding it. But after nearly an hour of unsuccessful labour on the part of the triumvirate, our

companions laid down their rods upon the sloping heathery bank behind, and themselves on a more smooth and open spot of turfy verdure, and soon was the surrounding air made odorous by the softly spreading vapour of cigars. We thought there was now no harm in trying the central portion of the tail of the stream, *per fas aut nefas*. And this we did without moving from our position on the cruive, but not by casting, which the distance made impossible. We simply let out with the hand the requisite length of reel-line, which the swift coursing water carried speedily away downwards, with our fly at the far end, and in this way we soon reached the desired portion of the stream. We had scarcely *hung* our fly for a few seconds with a waving motion in the precise piece of water which had so often been traversed by *cross* angling so immediately before, than we raised and hooked a fine fresh-run fish. Our only fear now was of his taking himself down the water, as our line was already far spent, and we could not very rapidly have made our way along the large stones of the cruive-dyke, and up a steep rough knoll on the river-side, between the end of that dyke and the lower portion of the stream where the fish had been hooked, and was now gambolling. But he behaved most considerately, went splashing downwards at first for a few yards, (*we* had very few to spare, but of this the salmon was probably not aware,) and then came towards us just fast enough to admit of our reeling in a bountiful supply of line, and then, after cutting his capers for ten or twelve minutes within reasonable distance, he ran his snout close in shore, where he grubbed about for the first and last time, being speedily gaffed by one of our companions.—P.S. No sooner was our fly taken out of his mouth, and set at liberty, than we again pursued a similar course, and immediately raised, hooked, and killed another fish, exactly in the same manner. We never moved from our position a single inch the whole time. Now, there is no doubt that both of these salmon had seen and resisted two excellent and very taking flies, brought skilfully over them, but cross-ways, and somewhat too rapidly, many times immediately before we hooked them. So much for *hovering*.*

We suppose we must now wind up, as we doubt not our readers are sufficiently exhausted, and we ourselves have other fish to fry. But as we have hitherto been giving only our own notions, let us finish off with a few passages from others of greater wisdom, and more enlarged experience. The following are Mr. Stoddart's recommendations how to act *on raising a fish*:—

* The compositor has three times made this word *hovering*, but we have got it right at last.

"When fly-fishing for salmon, the angler requires to have a general notion of where his hook is, and how it traverses the stream or pool; but this is all. To watch it minutely is not necessary. By doing so, the eye is frequently brought into inopportune contact with the fish itself when rising. It detects its pursuer before the salmon has seized the fly; and, as a natural consequence, the rods-man, in the surprise or flutter of the moment, is very apt either to draw away his hook by a sudden or violent jerk, or else to check its progress for the moment, and allow opportunity for the fish to discern the deception. In trout-fishing with the fly, we can scarcely, in the event of a break on the surface, strike too rapidly. It is different in salmon-fishing. Here one should not alter the motion of the hook, until he is actually made sensible of the presence of the fish, by feeling his weight upon the line; nor even then is there any act of exertion required on the part of the angler, further than the simple raising of his rod, in order to fix the hook. When force is applied, or any motion approaching to a jerk made use of, the chances are, that either the line itself, or the jaw of the fish gives way; whereas, a line of mere ordinary strength, and the tenderer parts of the mouth, will always sufficiently resist the slight impulse which is required in order to hook salmon. But I need not say more on this matter, for it will become natural to one practising on a salmon-river, and travelling the fly properly, to strike, as it were with effect, and also to make the most of such rises or attempts on the part of fish to seize the hook, as indicate something faulty in its humour or vision."—P. 264.

In regard to the practice of changing the fly, when a salmon has risen and missed his aim, our author thinks as follows:—

"For my own part, I am commonly content to find out a killing fly in the one which induces a fish to rise; and the reason I have for substituting another, should a salmon merely break the surface without taking hold, is not that I expect the substitute to prove a whit more enticing, but I would do all in my power to prevent the distrust and alarm, possibly consequent upon a repeated transit of the identical lure. This distrust, however, be it noted, is only a possible event, as regards the fly-hook in question; and the substitution of another, so far from acting as a counter charm, may, on the contrary, operate strongly to my prejudice, occasioning or confirming the very alarm I am endeavouring to suppress.

"The expediency, therefore, of changing the fly immediately over a grilse or salmon, on the failure of its attempt to take hold, is very questionable; nor although occasionally acting on it, am I a slave to the practice. If led to believe that the fish has missed his aim, less from shyness than over-keenness, or, it may be, owing to the inconvenience of place or position, the rapid nature of the current, improper management of the line, or other cause, most assuredly I would not change the fly over him, until convinced that he had no inclination to rise a second time; even then I should be chary of trusting a new hook without allowing him an interval of rest, not shorter than a

quarter of an hour. In passing, however, the first fly over him a second time, I would use little or no delay. The humour he is in for rising at it has already been tested, and there is some possibility of its subsiding, should the opportunity be given. Was I convinced, however, that the fish started, came towards the hook in a dubious distrustful mood, I would then most assuredly allow him a reasonable respite of some minutes, and at the same time substitute another fly of smaller dimensions,—I do not say less gaudy in appearance, but rather the contrary; for it is well-known, in respect to Scottish rivers, that the Irish fly, with all its glitter, is most killing under a clear sky, and on low limpid water; while the Scottish one, sober in hue, develops its attractive powers in dull windy weather, and not unfrequently when the streams are of a deep porter colour, the delight of the trout-fisher's eye. This refused, I would experiment according to the state of the river, with a larger one, and finally, as a last resort, recur to the hook first employed.”—P. 266.

We dare not now venture on any comparison between the peculiar pleasures afforded by our great southern river the Tweed, and such as are yielded by our more northern waters. No stream in Britain equals the Tweed for the *quantity* of killing sport that may be obtained in it, especially if under the auspices of the powers that be. We are ourselves practically norse-men, the “northern powers” having hitherto accorded every kindness both to ourselves and friends. And is not the *quality* or nature of that northern sport the more intellectual and exciting of the two? We think it is, and so does our ingenious “Scottish Angler,” even although his household hearth, and all his home affections, are now concentrated by the banks of the great border river.

“When I speak, however, of salmon-fishing,” says Mr. Stoddart, “I renounce all allusion to it as practised under that name by the aristocratic frequenters of certain portions of the Tweed. To those who live at a distance from this river, the feats recorded and vaunted of from time to time by these noble piscatores, may appear, as displays of skill and craft, highly creditable to the parties engaged. To the spectators of them, they are, in many instances, next thing to farcical, quite undeserving the name and character of feats of sport, and in reality are no more the achievements of those professing to execute them, than Punch and Judy is the veritable unassisted performance of a set of wooden puppets.”—P. 246.

“But I come to the description of the sport itself, so termed, although in my opinion but partially entitled to that designation, so far, at least, as regards the possession of skill and judgment on the part of the angler, and also in respect to the kind of salmon forming the majority of those killed, and which, in the spring season, consist with comparatively few exceptions, of kelts and baggits. These, although they sometimes run long and sullenly, are very far from having the activity of clean-run salmon; moreover, they are totally unfit, after being captured, for human use, retaining neither the internal curdiness nor

rich taste of properly conditioned fish. As exercising, moreover, the ingenuity of the sportsman, they are quite at fault, possessing a voracity that, on occasions of great success, induces disgust and satiety rather than satisfaction or triumph.

“For my own part I would rather capture in spring a single newly-run salmon than a whole boat-load of kelts. Yet these, and no others, are the fish frequently vaunted of as affording, under the name of salmon, amusement to some brainless boaster, some adept by purchase, not by skill, in the noble art of angling. For, let me ask, what all the science displayed by this sort of salmon-slayer consists of? Is he versed in the mysteries of rod and tackle, taught by experience what fly to select—when, where, or how to fish? Is this amount of knowledge at all necessary? Nothing of the kind. The performer has no will or say in the matter. In every act, in the choice of his fly and casting-line, in the position and management of the boat, he is under the control of the tacksman. By him he is directed where to heave his hook, and, if a novice, how. Nothing is left for his own fancy or discretion. He has forfeited all freedom of action. Nay more, he is fettered with the presence of his griping taskmaster. Enough it is that he pays, and that handsomely, for the sport so termed, of hauling within reach of the gaff-hook a miserable kelt or two, which, when secured, he sees no more of, and is unable, unless by purchase, to exhibit as a trophy to his friends.”—P. 248.

“That salmon-fishing, as practised from the boat on Tweed, is upon the whole a very agreeable recreation, affording exercise and some measure of joyous excitement to the person engaged in it, I do not mean to deny; but it is not, to my mind, nearly so pleasurable or satisfactory a sport as when pursued on foot. Give me a stream which I can readily command, either from the bank, or by means of wading—a dark, hill-fed water, like the Lochie or the Findhorn, full of breaks, runs, pools, and gorges—give me the waving birch-wood, the cliff and ivyed scaur, tenanted by keen-eyed kestrel or wary falcon—more than this, give me solitude, or the companionship—not less relishable—of some ardent and kindred spirit, the sharer of my thoughts and felicity—give me, in such a place, and along with such an on-looker, the real sport of salmon-fishing—the rush of some veteran water monarch, or the gambol and caracol of a plump new-run grilse, and talk no more of that monotonous and spiritless semblance of the pastime, which is followed by the affluent, among the dubs and dams of our border river.”—P. 250.

And now, what says that accomplished painter and piscator, Mr. Scrope, whose very mind and body both, have been steeped for twenty years in Tweed's fair streams, and who has immortalized himself by those immortal waters? We shall not put him to the question, nor the question to him, although we dare to say that “his heart's in the Highlands,”—at any rate, he confessedly prefers all running streams, wherever placed, to the injurious and rebounding sea.

* “No; the wild main I trust not. Rather let me wander beside the banks of the tranquil streams of the warm South, ‘in the yellow meads of Asphodel,’ when the young spring comes forth, and all nature is glad; or if a wilder mood comes over me, let me clamber among the steeps of the North, beneath the shaggy mountains, where the river comes foaming and raging everlastingly, wedging its way through the secret glen, whilst the eagle, but dimly seen, cleaves the winds and the clouds, and the dun deer gaze from the mosses above. There, amongst gigantic rocks, and the din of mountain torrents, let me do battle with the lusty salmon, till I drag him into day, rejoicing in his bulk, voluminous and vast.”*

As usual, Mr. Scrope is right. Both are best, and we ought to accept of either with grateful hearts.

“Farewell!—a word that must be, and hath been,
A sound which makes us linger.”

We request Mr. Scrope to give us the benediction.

“Farewell, then, dear brothers of the angle; and when you go forth to take your pleasure, either in the mountain stream that struggles and roars through the narrow pass, or in the majestic salmon-river that sweeps in lucid mazes through the vale, may your sport be ample, and your hearts light! But should the fish prove moresaucious than yourselves—a circumstance, excuse me, that is by no means impossible; should they, alas!—but fate avert it,—reject your hooked gifts, the course of the river will always lead you to pleasant places. In these we leave you to the quiet enjoyment of the glorious works of the Creation, whether it may be your pleasure to go forth when the spring sheds its flowery fragrance, or in the more advanced season, when the sere leaf is shed incessantly, and wafted on the surface of the swollen river.”†

* *Days and Nights, &c.*, p. 87.

† *Ibid.*, p. 254.

- ART. III.—1. *The Worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary in the Church of Rome, &c.* By J. ENDELL TYLER, B.D., Rector of St. Giles's in the Fields, and Canon Residentiary of St. Paul's. London: Printed for the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, 1846.
2. *Popery; its Character and Crimes.* By W. ELFE TAYLER. London, 1847.
3. *Devotion to the Holy Virgin; or the Knowledge and Love of Mary.* Translated from the French of Father de GALLIFET, S. J., and dedicated to our Lady, Help of Christians. London, 1847.
4. *The Rosary of the Blessed Virgin Mary. A Selection of Poetry, &c.* By a Member of the Sodality of the Living Rosary.
5. *The Glories of Mary, &c., with Copious Notes from the Works of St. Francis Liguori.* Translated into English, and carefully revised, by a Catholic Priest. Fifth Edition. Dublin, 1845.
6. *A Short Treatise on the Antiquity, Institution, Excellency, Indulgences, Privileges, &c., of the most Famous and Ancient Confraternity of our Blessed Lady of Mount Carmel, commonly called the Scapular.* Dublin, 1845.
7. *Devout Prayers in Honour of the Holy Name of Mary.* "The heavens have announced the Name of Mary, and all the people have seen the glory thereof." London.

THE writer of these pages attended a meeting in London during last May, when M. Boucher, the editor of a Paris journal called the *Voir Nouvelle*, read the following Prayer to the Virgin Mary, and declared that it was printed and circulated by the Jesuits in France :—

"TO MARY.

"Our Mother who art in Heaven, let your Name be blessed for ever; let your love come to all hearts; let your desires be accomplished on earth as in Heaven. Give us this day grace and mercy; give us the pardon of our sins, as our hope is from your goodness without end; and leave us no more to fall into temptation, but deliver us from evil.—Amen."

This prayer produced a great sensation in the audience. It was read again by Sir Culling Eardley at a meeting of the Evangelical Alliance held in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, on the 7th of June. There its authenticity was denied by a Mr. Matthias Dunn, who wrote to the publishers, Messrs. Alcan & Co., Paris, from whose establishment the tract purported to be issued, and obtained from them the following statement :—

"For our part, Rev. Sir, we affirm, on our honour, that neither among the old or the new stock of the firm have we met with any single prayer similar to the one we received in yours of the 12th inst.; and we hesitate not to set down the publication, as well as the forgery of our honourable signature, to the account of the Protestants—it not being the first time that our separated brethren have had recourse to such discreditable artifices in order to cast ridicule on us.

"In conclusion, then, we intentionally repeat our assertion, we are not the authors of this prayer, and do not hesitate to affirm that the Protestants are the sole authors of it."

Sir Culling immediately wrote to M. Boucher and other parties, and obtained the most satisfactory proof that the identical copy read in Exeter Hall had been purchased at the warehouse of the firm who charged the Protestants with the authorship, and with forging their "honourable signature." Very *mal apropos*, however, for those gentlemen, came out the awkward fact announced in the subjoined letter:—

"July 31, 1847.

"DEAR SIR,—The *Voix Nouvelle* of July 28th contains the following extracts from the judicial journals of Paris:—'An action has been brought against M. Alcan, Publisher of Engravings, and M. René, Printer!—the former for not making the legal declaration of an Engraving representing the apparition of the Holy Virgin; the latter for the same offence, and for not depositing the letterpress accompanying the Engraving!! The Tribunal of Correctional Police (6th Chambre) has delivered to-day (July 3, 1847,) its judgment in the affair. It HAS CONDEMNED M. ALCAN TO A MONTH OF IMPRISONMENT and a Fine of a Hundred Francs; and M. René to a Fine of Five Thousand Francs; One Thousand for Non-Declaration, One Thousand for not making the Deposit, and *Three Thousand for omitting the Name of the Printer*; and has sentenced both to pay costs in equal shares.'

"These are the parties (at least one of them) who wished the people of Newcastle to believe them about the *name of the Printer* on the celebrated Prayer to the Virgin.

"The providence of God has wonderfully interfered and convicted M. Alcan of being in the habit of publishing works, and fraudulently evading the responsibility of publication.

"I beg you to insert this Letter in the Newcastle Papers, in confirmation of the proof which I have already afforded, that Messrs. Alcan's denial of the authenticity of the Prayer, bearing the name of their predecessor, Victor Janet, is not to be credited.—I am, &c.

"ROBT. WALTERS, Esq.

"C. E. EARDLEY."

Passing along Fleet Street, London, soon after reading this correspondence, I noticed a crowd of people standing at a bookseller's shop, (Richardson's, No. 172,) reading a placard hung up at the windows, from which the following is an extract:—

“✠ TO THE GREATER GLORY OF ALMIGHTY GOD.

“*May it please the kind and well-minded Protestant to read and consider*

“ I.—The Catholic Church does retain the second commandment as well as the nine others, as may be seen in the Catholic Bible, Exodus, xx. 3, 4, 5, and in the Catholic Testament, Matth. iv. 10, also in the Catholic Catechism, or, ‘ Abstract of the Christian Doctrine,’ chap. iv., which all Catholic children are made to learn by heart. Moreover, the Catholic examines his conscience on this matter when preparing for confession, as is clear from the ‘ Examination of conscience on the ten commandments,’ to be found in the ‘ Garden of the Soul,’ a prayer-book which is in the hands of all Catholics.

“ II.—The Catholic Church deprives no person whatsoever of the benefit of the holy Scripture; but wishes all men to read it as the word of God. Catholic Bibles and Catholic Testaments may be had in all languages, from all Booksellers, and in every country under the sun.

“ III.—*Catholics do not adore the Blessed Virgin Mary, nor the Angels, nor the Saints, nor any being whatsoever, except God Almighty. All charges against the Catholic Church on that head are grounded on misconception of her doctrine. See the Catechism, chap. iv., as above.*”

Richardson and Son are the most extensive Roman Catholic publishers in the United Kingdom. Their principal establishment is at Derby; they have another warehouse in Fleet Street, London, and a third in Capel Street, Dublin. It so happened that the writer was proceeding to Dublin when he noticed the above placard, which announced that Catholics do not adore the Virgin Mary; and there he visited Richardson’s shop, and purchased all the Catholic publications named at the head of this Article. Much more of the same kind might have been obtained—and all at low prices. It was painful to see respectable ladies, with intelligent countenances, eagerly seeking such productions, and other articles of superstition connected with the worship of the Virgin Mary.

It is a singular fact, that this worship should be so openly and zealously inculcated and recommended among Catholics, and at the same time vehemently denied among Protestants. Are those who so passionately worship the “ Holy Name of Mary,” ashamed to confess that name before heretics?—or are they conscious that the worship is unwarranted and indefensible? There is no doubt that the Church of Rome is about to assume a new attitude in this country. Through Maynooth it has been so connected with the State as to make the whole nation responsible for its teaching. Its missionaries are prodigiously multiplied in the British colonies, with the sanction of Government, and at the expense of the people of the United Kingdom. In England,

The Tablet assures us, the Catholic hierarchy is about to be fully established, while the Courts of St. James's and the Vatican are about to interchange envoys, and, for the first time since the Reformation, to maintain relations of amity. Of the wisdom of such relations we do not here pronounce any opinion. But, if they should directly, or indirectly, involve further sanction and support of the Roman Catholic religion by the Government of this country, it behoves the people—to whom the Government is responsible, and who are themselves responsible to Him who will not give His glory to another—to know what the system really is to whose maintenance and propagation they are committed by their rulers.

It is in no party or sectarian spirit that we approach this subject. We have no purpose to serve by exaggeration or distortion. We wish to speak nothing but the truth, and we should be sorry to speak it in acrimony. We will state simple facts on indubitable authority—and in such a spirit, we trust, as will commend them to the candid attention of Roman Catholics as well as Protestants. It concerns *them*, and we pray that they may lay it seriously to heart.

In the performance of this task we have an excellent example set us by the author of the first work on our list. His feeling towards the Church of Rome would be considered by some far too indulgent. But though he does not speak harshly, and is evidently reluctant to pronounce the painful conclusion to which his investigations irresistibly conduct him, yet he deals honestly with his subject, and fully establishes, and ably vindicates the great principles of Protestantism. If Mr. Tayler, the clever author of "Popery, its Character and Crimes," read Mr. Tyler's work, he would see that an argument loses nothing of its force or effect, by its freedom from offensive and opprobrious epithets, printed in vehement capitals. His book, however, abounds in information and illustrations, which may arrest the Romeward tendencies of Protestants, and be available in controversy, though we cannot approve of the spirit in which it is written.

We are inclined to think that Protestants are not generally aware of the extent to which the Virgin Mary engrosses the worship of the Church of Rome. A few extracts from the Jesuit Father Gallifet will give them some idea of it :—

"To whom do men recur for relief more confidently in their spiritual and temporal wants than to Mary? To whom do sinners fly to obtain pardon of their crimes sooner than to Mary, who is their refuge? * * * Confidence in this powerful Mediatrix is so engraven in the hearts of the faithful, that even in unforeseen accidents, under which by an involuntary impulse one recurs to God, Mary is

not forgotten. * * * If one open the rituals and pontificals which serve for the most sacred functions, namely, the administration of the sacraments, &c., the Name of Mary, the Intercession, the Invocation of Mary, is found throughout them. The Eternal Father wills that nothing be demanded of Him but through the merits of his Son, and it would seem the Son wills that all our prayers should be presented to Him through the hands of his Mother. In this spirit the Church begins and ends each canonical hour by invoking her. * * * Children can no sooner speak than they are taught to pronounce the sacred names of Jesus and Mary. The first forms of prayer they are taught are the *Pater Noster* and *Ave Maria*; the first instruction they receive after having learned to know, adore, love, and hope in God, and Jesus Christ his Son, is to honour the Blessed Mother, and to invoke her in all times and necessities. Those prayer-books which are continually in use among the faithful are full of hymns, litanies, offices, &c., in honour of Mary."

"Here, again," he adds, "I may cite the example of the Holy Church—

"Nothing can be more ardent, sweet, and tender than the prayers she addresses to Mary, and the practices she consecrates to her honour. If you look upon this Church diffused throughout the universe, you will remark her love and devotion for the Blessed Mother. After the festivals of our Lord, what feasts are celebrated with more fervour than those of Mary? What churches are more frequented, what confraternities more numerous, what images more common, even in private houses, than those of this glorious Virgin? Her statue may be seen at the entrance to cities, over the doors of public buildings, on roads, &c.; in all places it appears before the people as the most tender object, after Jesus, of their confidence and love. Whose praises are more willingly listened to, after those of our Lord, than the praises of His Blessed Mother? Whose name, after His, is oftenest on the lips and in the hearts of His servants? These two sacred appellations, *Jesus, Mary*, are never separated in the mouth of the faithful, in life or death, in prosperity or adversity. They are like a precious balm which assuages our evils, a remedy for our maladies, an arm of defence against our enemies."—*Devotion to the Holy Virgin*, pp. 53-56.

This is a true picture; but it is only an outline, which it is our purpose to fill up—or rather we shall let the Church herself fill it up. No Roman Catholic can say that she lays on the colours too deeply, or charge her with exaggeration. We shall first avail ourselves of the prescribed services and authorized formularies in her Missals and Breviaries. The references in the following extracts are to the Roman Breviary, published at Norwich, with the Pope's approbation, by the Rev. F. C. Husenbeth, in the year 1830, in four volumes, containing the services of the four quarters of the year, Vern., Aest., Aut., Hiem.

In the post-communion on the day of the Assumption, this prayer is offered—

“We, partakers of the heavenly board, implore thy clemency, O Lord our God, that we who celebrate the Assumption of the Mother of God, may by *her intercession* be freed from all impending evils.”

The same petition is preferred in various forms. These are prayers to God to grant blessings for Mary’s sake. But they do not involve direct worship. The Church, however, supplicates her in the following terms:—

“Holy Mother of God, pray for us. Mirror of Justice, Cause of our Joy, Mystical Rose, Tower of David, Tower of Ivory, House of Gold, Ark of the Covenant, Gate of Heaven, Refuge of Sinners, Queen of Angels, Queen of all Saints, &c., pray for us.”—*Vern.* 239.

“The Glories of Mary,” by Liguori, is a commentary upon the prayer called the “*Salve Regina*,” which is as follows:—

“Hail! Holy Queen, Mother of Mercy, our Life, Sweetness, and Hope, hail! To thee we sigh, groaning and weeping in this valley of tears. Come then, our advocate, turn those compassionate eyes of thine on us; show to us Jesus, the blessed fruit of thy womb, O merciful, O pious, O sweet Virgin Mary! Pray for us, O Holy Mother of God, that we may be rendered worthy of the promises of Christ.”—*Aest.* 151.

We have next to consider prayers to Mary which make no allusion to her intercession, but implore blessings as if completely at her own disposal, and exactly in the same terms as if they were sought from the Supreme Being. It is thus the whole Roman Church throughout the world addresses Mary:—“Do thou for the accused loose their bonds; for the blind bear forth a light; drive away our evils; demand for us all good things. *Show that thou art a Mother!*”

In the Roman Breviary, we find a rubric directing that the *Gloria* should be repeated at the end of every psalm except when otherwise noted. Instead of this ascription of praise to the Trinity, the Church of Rome, on certain occasions—as the Feast of the Assumption for example—substitutes an anthem to the Virgin, by which “she does all that can be done to fix the thoughts of the worshipper on Mary, and to apply the spirit of the psalm to *her*;—a practice,” says Mr. Tyler, “which sanctions the excesses into which Bonaventura and others have run, in their departure from the purity and integrity of primitive worship.” At the conclusion of the eighth psalm, we find two anthems annexed thus:—“O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the world.” Ant.—“The Holy Mother of God is exalted above the choir of angels to the heavenly realms. The

gates of Paradise are opened to us by thee, O Virgin, who gloriest this day triumphantly with the angels." To the last verse of 95th psalm (Heb. and English, 96th,) an anthem is immediately appended.—"He shall judge the earth in equity, and the people with his truth." Ant.—"Rejoice, O Virgin Mary, thou alone hast destroyed all heresies in the whole world. Deem me worthy to praise thee, hallowed Virgin. Give me strength against my enemies."

The following is called, in the Roman Breviary, "A Prayer to the Blessed Virgin before the celebration of the Mass :"—

"O Mother of pity and mercy, most Blessed Virgin Mary, I, a miserable and unworthy sinner, flee to thee with my whole heart and affection, and I pray thy sweetest pity, that as thou didst stand by thy sweetest Son upon the cross, so thou wouldest vouchsafe of thy clemency to stand by me, a miserable priest, and by all priests, who here, and in all the Holy Church, offer Him this day; that, *aided by thy grace*, we may be enabled to offer a worthy and acceptable victim in the sight of the most high and undivided Trinity. Amen."—TYLER, p. 3, &c.

Next in authority to the standards and formularies of the Church, are the writings of her canonized Saints, which are carefully examined, and solemnly sanctioned before their author is admitted into the calendar—a process in which the Church is believed to act infallibly. Among authorities of this class, Bonaventura stands pre-eminent. He was born in 1221, and died in 1274. He was of the Order of St. Francis, and was raised to the highest ecclesiastical dignities. Pope Clement IV. offered to him the Archbishopric of York, which he refused. But Gregory X. made him a cardinal-bishop. More than two centuries after his death, he was canonized by Sixtus IV. on the 14th of April 1482. He declares, in his diploma, that the three persons of the Godhead had testified to the fact that Bonaventura was a saint in Heaven; and adds—"He so wrote on divine subjects that the *Holy Spirit seems to have spoken in him*." In 1585, Sixtus V. ordered his works to be most carefully emended, and pronounced him to be an acknowledged Doctor of the Church, directing his authority to be cited and employed in all places of education, and in all ecclesiastical discussions and studies. In these documents he is called the "Seraphic Doctor." It is impossible, therefore, that higher sanction should be given to the writings of any human being. What he teaches concerning the attributes and worship of Mary must be taken as the teaching of the Church.*

* The edition of his works used by Mr. Tyler was published at Mentz in 1609, and the passages referred to occur in vol. vi. between pp. 400 and 506.

The most remarkable of his works is his Psalter, in which the name of Mary is substituted throughout for that of God. However painful to the feelings of the reader, it is necessary to give a few extracts :—

Psalm xxx.—“ In thee, O Lady, have I trusted ; let me not be confounded for ever.—Thou art my fortitude and my refuge ; my consolation and my protection.—Into thy hands, O Lady, I commend my spirit, my whole life, and my last day.”

Psalm xxxi.—“ Blessed are they whose hearts love thee, O Virgin Mary ; their sins shall be mercifully blotted out *by thee*.”

Psalm xxxv. 2.—“ Incline thou the countenance of God upon us ; *compel Him* (coge illum) to have mercy upon sinners. O Lady, thy mercy is in the heaven, and thy grace is spread over the whole earth.”

Psalm lxvii.—“ Let Mary arise, and let her enemies be scattered.”

Bonaventura was resolved that Jehovah should have no form of worship which he might call his own. The distinction between *Latria* and *Hyperdulia*, if it could be maintained, would be a perfect nullity in the practical devotion of the multitude. But even among divines, and with the highest authorities in the Church, it is a miserable subterfuge. Bonaventura has laid his idolatrous hands on the *Te Deum*, the *Athanasian Creed* and the *Litany*, as well as the Psalter. Here is the Catholic *Te Deum* :—

“ We praise thee, Mother of God ; we acknowledge thee, Mary the Virgin.

“ All the earth doth worship thee, Spouse of the Eternal Father.

“ To thee all angels and archangels, thrones and principalities faithfully do service.

“ To thee, the whole angelic creation with incessant voice, proclaim, Holy ! Holy ! Holy ! Mary, Parent, Mother of God, and Virgin.

* * * Thou with thy Son sittest at the right hand of the Father.

“ O Lady, *save thy people*, that we may partake of the inheritance of thy Son ;—And govern us and guard us for ever. * * *

“ Vouchsafe, O Sweet Mary, to keep us now and for ever without sin. Have mercy upon us, O pious one—have mercy upon us.

“ Let thy mercy be made great with us ; because in thee, O Virgin Mary, we put our trust. In thee, sweet Mary, do we hope ; defend us for ever.

“ Praise becomes thee. Empire becomes thee. To thee be virtue and glory for ever and ever. Amen.”

There is no foundation whatever, either in Scripture, history, or tradition, for the doctrine of the *Assumption* ; and yet this the Church, by the mouth of Bonaventura, requires to be believed on pain of everlasting damnation.

“ Whoever shall be saved, *before all things it is necessary that he hold firm the faith concerning the Virgin Mary ; which except a man keep*

whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. * *. Whom at length he took (*assumpsit*) himself into heaven; and she sitteth at the right hand of her Son, not ceasing to pray to her Son for us. This is the faith concerning the Virgin Mary; which except every one believe faithfully and firmly, he cannot be saved."

In the Litany addressed to Mary, these sentences occur:—

"Holy Mary, whom all things praise and venerate, pray for us.—Be propitious—spare us, O Lady. From all evil deliver us, O Lady.—In the devastating hour of death, deliver us, O Lady.—From the horrible torments of hell, deliver us, O Lady. We sinners, do beseech thee to hear us. That thou wouldest be pleased to give eternal rest to all the faithful departed, we beseech thee to hear us, O Lady."

The following prayer, from the same canonized Saint, will be found in his works (vol. vi. p. 406,) though its existence has often been doubted or denied, by reason of its incredible blasphemy:—

"Therefore, O Empress, and our most benign Lady, *by the right of a Mother* command thy most beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, that he vouchsafe to raise our minds from the love of earthly things to heavenly desires, who liveth and reigneth.—*Jure Matris impera tuo dilectissimo filio.*"

The phrase in the Liturgy—*Monstra te esse Matrem*—has received from the worshippers of Mary a two-fold interpretation, the one referring to Christ, and the other to Christians. The first is that conveyed in the prayer of Bonaventura, and adopted by crowds of his imitators. The second is founded on the passage in the Gospel of John, where our Lord commits his aged Mother to the care of his beloved disciple, and says to her, "Behold thy Son." It is said that John here represents all Christians,—and that they were thus constituted the children of Mary. But they have another idea of her relationship to God, which would give her a natural claim over the redeemed as their mother. She is "the Spouse of the Eternal Father." In this capacity, too, she has work to do with the Deity. In a collection of hymns to her honour called—"Nouveau Recueil de Cantiques à l'usage des Confréries des Paroisses de Paris," Paris, 1839, p. 175, we have the following as part of a hymn—what an idea it gives of the Supreme Ruler!—

"Calm the rage of thy heavenly husband!

Let him show himself kind to all those that are thine!

Of thy heavenly husband calm the rage!

Let his heart be soften'd towards us."

—TYLER, pp. 24, 29–34.

Mr. Tayler has some forcible remarks on the practice of the

Church of Rome, in picturing the Saviour as "a babe at the breast, while Mary stands forth in all the dignity of the Empress of heaven and earth." The natural effect of this constant association of ideas is at once to lower the infinite greatness and glory of the Redeemer to the condition of a mere infant, and to exalt his redeemed creature, the Virgin, at his expense, as a glorious queen, adorned with a crown, and radiant with gems! or, as is frequently done, as "the woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars!"—P. 238.

When Mr. Tayler wrote this, he was probably not aware of the whole extent to which the Church of Rome has gone in representing the infantile condition of Christ, and the maternal authority and discipline to which he was subject. While she compels belief in the immaculate conception and sinless life of Mary, she would give us to understand that JESUS was a troublesome charge to his mother, and that if she had spared the rod, she might have spoiled the child! In a work recently published (*Notes of a Residence at Rome in 1846, by a Protestant Clergyman*, Rev. A. Vicary, B.A.,) we have an account of a representation so astounding that we could scarcely have received it on an authority less respectable. But Mr. Vicary is upright and candid, and of his veracity there can be no question. He says:—

"Leaving the square at Lucca, which contains the cathedral, built with alternate pieces of black and white marble, I entered a long and narrow street; and when I had traversed it for about half a mile, I suddenly came upon the ancient and massive church of San Martino. The church was undergoing some repairs, so I did not see it to the advantage that I could have wished. It contains some pictures by the old masters, several altars, as usual, and a few monuments. But the object that struck me most, and deeply interested my attention, was a fresco painting on the west end, and on the outside. It so completely represents the effect and intention of the Roman Catholic religion, that I cannot forbear detailing it minutely here. The Virgin is represented *inflicting corporal punishment upon the youthful Jesus. She holds a rod in her hand; with the other she holds the garments of the child. She is in the act of inflicting punishment. The child is in alarm, and its eyes are eagerly directed to St. Anna, the mother of the Virgin, in the background, entreating her intercession to escape the cruel ordeal.* The look of the Virgin is not that of affection, but has the stern and harsh appearance which we might imagine a schoolmistress to have when engaged in a similar occupation. Under the picture is written in very legible characters, '*Jure matris rege filio.*' This picture is better executed than those which are generally to be found at the corners of the streets, or on the outside of the churches. It is the most remarkable, and in its subject one of the most daring, that I have seen; and con-

tains within its compass much of the spirit that is infused into the Roman Catholic Church. Considering that the Saviour came into the world, and was born of a virgin—that he took the nature of man upon him—they infer that he was not only subject to the infirmities of that nature, but with its sorrows was liable also to its sins. The book of the Scripture was either closed, or told a tale to unwilling ears, that ‘he was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners;’ and, of course, as he was free from the sins of human nature, he must have been also from the punishments with which earthly parents visit the violation of duty. We are told, indeed, ‘that he was subject unto them,’ and continued with them; but we hear, from the same unerring authority, that his life was as spotless and perfect even then as his source was undeniably holy and divine; for he daily ‘increased in wisdom, and in favour with God and man.’ But revelation was to be set aside, and reverence violated, to serve an object; and so we find the Virgin Mary here exalted at the expense of the Saviour. The awful reverence with which God dwelling in the flesh should be contemplated, is here transferred altogether to another object. The argument which the representation is designed to inculcate, and the feeling they wished to produce on the mind of the beholder, was, that, as mother, she possessed more power than the Son (he by whom all things were made,) and so more than him was entitled to the regard, fear, homage, and worship of the Christian world.”

Bernardinus de Bustis was the celebrated author of the Office of the “Immaculate Conception,” which was confirmed by the bull of Sixtus IV., and has since been used by the Church on the 8th of December. He wrote various works on the Virgin under the title of *Mariale*. The following are specimens of his teaching:—

“In the fourth place, he may *appeal to her*, if any one feels himself *aggrieved by the justice of God!* For whereas God has justice and mercy, he retained justice to himself to be exercised in this world, and granted mercy to his mother; and thus if any one feels himself to be aggrieved in the Court of God’s justice, let him appeal to the Court of mercy of his mother.”

In another place, he thus exalts Mary:—

“Since the Virgin Mary is the mother of God, and God is her son, and every son is *naturally inferior to his mother, and subject to her*, and the mother is preferred above and is superior to her son, it follows that THE BLESSED VIRGIN IS HERSELF SUPERIOR TO GOD, and GOD himself is her *subject*, by reason of the humanity derived from her. * * O unspeakable dignity of Mary, who was worthy to *command* the Commander of all!”—(Cologne, 1607, Part iii. Sermon 2, p. 176; Part ix. Sermon. p. 605; Part xii. Sermon 2, p. 816, *apud Tyler*, p. 42.)

There was another Bernardine—Bernardinus Sennensis—who was a canonized Saint. He, like his namesake, writes about Mary in a perfect delirium of idolatry. He states that “all

things, even GOD, are servants of the empire of the Virgin ;"—that "by the law of succession and the right of inheritance, the primacy and kingdom of the whole universe is due to the blessed Virgin ;"—that she "could annul the will of her son, if made to the prejudice of herself ;"—that "from the time she conceived God, she obtained a certain jurisdiction and authority in every temporal procession of the Holy Spirit, so that no creature could obtain any grace or virtue from God, except according to the dispensation of his Virgin Mother."

"The Blessed Virgin alone has done more for God, or as much (so to speak) as God hath done for the whole human race ! I verily believe that God will excuse me if I now speak for the Virgin. Let us then gather together into one mass what things God hath done for man ; and let us consider what satisfaction the Virgin Mary hath returned to the Lord."

Bernardine then enumerates various particulars, (of many of which the ordinary feelings of reverence and *delicacy* forbid the transfer into these pages,) putting one against the other in a sort of debtor and creditor account, and then summing up the total, thus :—

"Therefore, setting each individual thing one against another, namely, what things God hath done for man, and what things the Blessed Virgin has done for God, you will see that *Mary has done more for God than God has for man* : so that thus, on account of the Blessed Virgin (whom, nevertheless, He himself made,) *God is, in a certain manner, under greater obligations to us than we are to Him !*"—(Serm. 6, p. 120. Paris, 1636.)—TYLER, p. 47.

In 1816, there was a work published in London, called "The Imitation of the Virgin Mary," composed on the plan of the "Imitation of Christ," by Thomas a-Kempis, and approved by T. R. Anselmi, Doctor of Sorbonne, late Bishop of Boulogne. This work abounds in passages like the following, designed, like so many similar productions, to make Christ the object of dread, and Mary the object of love and confidence :—

"Mother of my Redeemer, O Mary, in the last moment of my life, I implore thy assistance with more earnestness than ever. I find myself, as it were, placed between heaven and hell. Alas ! what will become of me, if thou do not exert in my behalf thy powerful influence with Jesus ? I die with *submission*, since Jesus has ordained it ; but notwithstanding the natural horror which I have of death, I die *with pleasure*, because I die under *thy* protection."—P. 344.

Nothing that we have quoted exceeds in force the language of the late Pope Gregory XVI., in his Encyclical Letter which appeared in 1832, and may be found in the *Laity Directory* for 1833.

He says he selected the date of the "most Blessed Virgin's triumphant Assumption in heaven ; that *She* who has been through every great calamity, our patroness and protectress, may *watch over us writing to you, and lead our mind* by her heavenly influence to those councils which may prove most salutary to Christ's flock."—And he calls her "our greatest confidence, *even the whole foundation of our hope.*—*Nostra maxima fiducia, imo toto ratio spei nostræ.*"

The most extravagant devotee of the dark ages could say no more than this. The author of this language canonized a Saint (Francis Liguori) in 1839, who has written much on the subject of the Virgin's offices and glory. Many of his works have been recently reprinted and widely circulated. Among these the most popular is "The Glories of Mary ;"—which, with all his other productions, received the sanction of the sacred College of Cardinals and several Popes. We are told by the author of his Life, prefixed to the "Glories," published by Coyne, Dublin, in 1825, that—

"The cardinals were *unanimous* that the virtues of the deceased had attained the heroic degree ; which the Pope confirmed by his solemn decree of the 7th of May, 1807.

"The process of his beatification specifies that more than a hundred miracles were performed by the Saint during his life, and twenty-eight after death ! The Brief declaring him blessed, dated September 6th, 1816, authorized the celebration of a Mass in his honour, for which the Pope prescribed suitable prayers, every year in the dioceses of Nocera and St. Agatha. In consequence of numerous solicitations, his holiness was induced, on the 28th of February, 1818, to sign the decree which introduced the cause of this blessed man for canonization. At length the decree of his canonization was published by his late holiness, Pope Pius VIII., on the 16th of May, 1830, by his holiness, Pope Gregory XVI."—P. 21.

This work, therefore, is stamped with the highest authority which the Church of Rome could possibly give it. The edition before us is "carefully revised by a Catholic Priest." He takes great pains to free Liguori from the charge of putting Mary in the place of Christ, by quoting other works of the author, in which the claims of the Deity are acknowledged, and by putting in explanatory phrases, and saving clauses, in marginal notes. He avails himself of the testimony of the Rev. Mr. Ward, the author of the "Ideal Church," who stands up for the orthodoxy of Liguori with great spirit. We shall first quote that testimony, and then give extracts from "The Glories of Mary," which will enable the reader to form a correct opinion of its value :—

"In his *Ideal of a Christian Church*, (page 427,) Mr. Ward, a clergyman of the Church of England, says : 'In a future chapter I hope to give a few quotations, merely by way of specimen, to show

the words of fervent, and tender, and glowing love and devotion with which St. Alphonsus Liguori was in the habit of speaking of our blessed Lord : a devotion to which, I believe, one may read the whole works of English high-church theologians, without finding the most distant parallel ; and I say this with a full remembrance of Bishop Andrews' most beautiful *Preces*. Here, indeed, I may as well add, that St. Alphonsus in his sermons, urges on all his hearers without exception, as a primary duty, that *every day of their lives* they should meditate intently at least a *quarter of an hour* on our Lord's blessed passion. How many of those who censure him as dishonouring our Lord, teach such doctrine as this ? I hope it may not be irreverent to him, if I put forth what some may mistake for a defence or an apology ; but it is of course our loss, and not his, if we fail in giving him his fitting honour ; and it is wholly for our sake, and not for his, that I wish to remove stumblingblocks from members of our Church—to do what may lie with an individual, that they may be saved from the most grievous sin under which so many unconsciously lie, of criticizing, nay, condemning saints. Mr. Palmer, who has read his life, and does not profess any doubt of its trustworthiness, speaks against the blessed saint in language which I should myself be unwilling to use in speaking of the most ordinarily serious Christian.'

"In page 428, Mr. Ward says : 'It is a most blasphemous irreverence to think, *on our own responsibility*, that a belief is *idolatrous* which saints *have held*.'

*

*

*

*

"Of course, when one reads the *Glories of Mary*, one must expect that the chief subject shall be what the title professes ; but it is impossible to read the ordinary works with any fairness, and doubt for a moment (even apart from the feeling which would lead any ordinarily humble mind to take *on faith* that so great a saint did not err in such a particular,) that his feeling of 'Latria' is exclusively given to God. One illustration I may especially mention ; the idea of *union* with our blessed Lord, to which I lately alluded, is peculiarly the ascription to him of a divine attribute. Now I will take upon myself to maintain a negative, and deny that any expression will be found throughout his writings in regard to the blessed Virgin of a similar nature,' (as those applied to Christ.)

"Let it be observed also, that the saints have their wills wholly and absolutely subject to the will of God. Theirs, then, is no arbitrary or capricious interference, but they pray for those objects, and in that degree, which is most fitting for carrying out God's most gracious purposes. This throws light on a form of expression which I acknowledge to be at first hearing very painful. Some most admirable Christians have at times used expressions, as though God the Father desired to punish, but God the Son prevailed on him to spare ; yet what more frightful heresy than to suppose any real contrariety of will between two persons of the ever-blessed Trinity ! Such expressions, then, whether well or ill-advised, are never understood by those who use them as *true* ; but as economical representations of Christ's interces-

sory office. And in precisely a similar manner, where like expressions are found concerning our *blessed Lord and St. Mary*, it is *absolutely unfounded to suppose that any opinion is implied so blasphemous* as that the blessed Virgin's love for us is otherwise than infinitely less than His who is perfect God."

Thus far Mr. Ward, who seems much more indignant at the thought of anything like "blasphemous irreverence" when directed to a Catholic "saint," than when its object is the blessed Redeemer. He thinks that Liguori's "feeling of *Latria* is exclusively given to God." Certainly this "*Latria*" must be something very incomprehensible, very much above the reach of mere readers of the Bible, if it be more unqualified, more intense, more sublimated, a more absolute adoration than that which is implied in the following passages, which are in no respect worse than hundreds which might be quoted; for every page of the book in which Mr. Ward can see nothing seriously wrong, is charged with the same perilous stuff, which, after all—we grieve to write it—is the orthodox divinity of the Roman Catholic Church, and presents to us those features of the system of which the Tractarians seem most enamoured. The importance of the subject must be our apology for the length of the extracts.

"And if Assuerus heard the petition of Esther through love, will not God, who has an infinite love for Mary, fling away at her request the thunderbolts which he was going to hurl on wretched sinners? When coming before the throne, she says, my King and my God, if I have found favour in your sight, (and she well knows that among all the children of Eve, she is the happy one who has found the grace forfeited by our first parents,) give me the life of my people; save those sinners whose cause I advocate. And will God reject her prayer? Is it not of her it is said, 'the law of clemency is on her lips?' Indeed, every petition she offers is as a law emanating from the Lord, according to which mercy is shown to those for whom she intercedes. St. Bernard, asking the question, why the Church calls Mary Queen of Mercy? answers it himself by saying, it is because she opens at pleasure the abyss of the Divine mercy, so that no sinner, however enormous his crimes may be, perishes, if he is protected by Mary."—P. 32.

"Let us go, then, Christians, let us go to this most gracious Queen, and crowd around her throne, without being deterred by our crimes and abominations. Let us be convinced that if Mary has been crowned Queen of Mercy, it is in order that the greatest sinners, who recommend themselves to her prayers, may be saved by her intercession, and form her crown in heaven."—P. 35.

"St. Bernardine of Sienna asserts, that if God has not destroyed man after his sin, it was in consideration of the blessed Virgin, and out of the singular love he bore her. He even doubts not but that all

the mercies granted to sinners in the Old Law have been given in consideration of Mary."—P. 97.

"An angel told St. Bridget that the prophets of the ancient law leaped for joy when they foresaw that Mary's purity and humility would appease God's wrath against those who had irritated him. She is that privileged Ark, where all who shelter themselves are saved from eternal shipwreck; the Ark of Noah not only preserved man, but even irrational creatures, and under the protection of Mary even sinners are saved. Our Lady one day appeared to St. Gertrude covered with a mantle, under which, as if in a place of refuge, were a troop of ferocious beasts, as lions, tigers, bears, and leopards. She was so far from driving them away, that, on the contrary, she patted them with her hand, and received them with great pity and commiseration. By this vision the saint understood, that the greatest sinners, when they recur to Mary, are saved by her prayers from eternal destruction. Let us, then, enter this Ark; let us conceal ourselves under the mantle of Mary: we there shall find life and salvation."—P. 100.

"St. Germanus, then, had reason to call Mary the 'Respiration of Christians.' For as the body cannot exist without breathing, so the soul shall scarcely live without recurring to the Mother of God. The blessed Alain being once assailed by violent temptations, was on the point of yielding for want of recommending himself to Mary. Being always devout to her, this holy Virgin appeared suddenly, and, striking him on the cheek, said, 'If thou hadst invoked me, Alain, thou wouldst not now be in this imminent danger.'

"God commanded Moses to make the propitiatory of most pure gold, because it was from thence he wished to speak to him. A learned writer says, that Mary is the propitiatory of the Christian people; whence our Lord gives them answers of pardon and forgiveness, and dispenses to them his gifts and graces. Why, asks Saint Ireneus, was not the mystery of the Incarnation accomplished without the consent of the Virgin? It is, he replies, because God wishes that she may be the principle of all good in the law of grace. 'O Mary,' exclaims the devout Blossius, 'who could avoid loving you? You who are our light in the obscurity of doubt—our consolation in grief—and our hope in danger. Hail! hope of those who are in despair. Hail! you to whom the Son of God has given such influence, that whatever you wish is executed instantly.'"—P. 134.

"St. Germanus also recognises Mary as the source of all good, the deliverance from all evil, '*O my Sovereign,*' says he to her, '*you alone has God given me as my guide in the pilgrimage of this world, as the strength of my weakness, the riches of my misery, the balm of my wounds, the soother of my pains, the deliverance from my bonds, hear the humble prayers of your servant, be moved by my tears, O my patroness! my refuge, my life, my hope, my salvation, my support.*'

"I would continue to search after him, (i. e. Christ,) and when I found him I would not suffer him to depart until he gave me his benediction. I shall enter into the precious caverns of his wounds, and

there conceal myself from his wrath; *but if my Saviour drive me off because of my sins*, I shall go and cast myself at the feet of his Mother; thence I shall not rise until she has obtained my pardon; for she does not know what it is to be insensible to the voice of misery, and *her pity will soften the anger of her Son*. Regard us then, O Mary, most merciful, for in you, after God, we, your servants, place all our hope." —P. 136.

"O Mother of God! hope of mankind! one of the strayed sheep, whom the eternal Word came to seek on earth, demands entrance again into this blessed fold. The price of its admittance is already paid, viz., the blood of his veins: one drop of which would suffice to cancel the sins of ten thousand worlds. No more is necessary than to apply to my soul the merits of this redeeming stream, and that is your province, Holy Virgin. To you it belongs to dispense the merits of this blood to whom you please: to you, then, I commit myself, that the enemy may not destroy me."—(P. 155.)

"We read in the Chronicles of St. Francis, that Brother Leo once saw in a vision two ladders; one red, at the summit of which was Jesus Christ; and the other white, at the top of which presided his Blessed Mother. He observed that some who endeavoured to ascend the first ladder, after mounting a few steps fell down, and on trying again were equally unsuccessful; but a voice having told them to make trial of the white ladder, they soon gained the top, the Blessed Virgin having held forth her hands to help them."—P. 236.

If Mr. Ward can see no *Latria* in all this—nothing but a degree of worship infinitely below what is due to the Creator and Redeemer, we despair of opening his eyes. He is gone far beyond the reach of logic. Indeed, he contradicts himself:—His idea of the *union* between Jesus Christ and the Virgin Mary, and his comparing it to the union between the persons of the Trinity, proves that his views of the Divine nature are most unworthy, and that his intellect has been bewitched by the singular fascination which Mariolatry exercises on the minds of men.

The hymns consecrated to this worship have not been remarkable for the beauty of their poetry.

However, the *Mariolaters* have done what in them lies to celebrate their divinity in verse. Hymns innumerable are sung in her praise. It was to make this part of her worship more attractive to persons of taste and cultivation, that "The Rosary" was composed. It is divided into three "Chaplets," on the "Joyful," "Sorrowful," and "Glorious Mysteries" of Mary's life. Of each of these classes of "Mysteries" there are five, and the Rosary consists in the repetition of certain prayers and meditations connected with the events, real or imaginary, of the Virgin's history and glorification. There is more of CHRIST in this volume than in most others of the kind. We are told

that "the greater portion of the book consists of Selections from the Psalter, and Hymns from the Roman and Parisian Breviary, translated into very beautiful English verse, by some of the first scholars of the University of Oxford." This circumstance will give the following extracts a peculiar interest to the Protestant reader.

The "dedication" begins thus:—

"O Virgin Mother! from the starry throne
On which thy Son hath placed thee, bend thine eyes
Upon a soul which trusts in *thee alone*,
To aid it from despondency to rise!"

In the piece called the "Ave Maria," we read:—

"When they address that tender one,
Who never yet hath asked her Son
A favour that He *could refuse*,
Because he graciously doth choose
To make her heart his treasure-store,
From whence he doth his mercy pour."—P. 16.

Again:—

"Now thou drinkest without measure,
From the Fount of Grace at pleasure,
Refresh us from thy boundless store.
That our prayers may reach God's throne,
Oh let them become thine own!
His Mother meets with no denials."—P. 213.

The following is in that amatory strain which so painfully characterizes many of the devotional books connected with the worship of Mary:—

"Say who that angel is, that with such glee
Beholds our Queen, and so enamoured glows
Of her high beauty, that all fire he seems."

"O Marye, grace o'erflowing,
O Queen of Heaven on high,
The Sun in splendour glowing,
Vouchsafe a gracious eye.

"O branch of Jesse flowering,
Spiritual olive tree,
Cypress on Zion towering,
Plane on the watery lea;
With freshening coolness bless us,
O Marye, gentle Marye,
When thirst and heat oppress us.

"To heal us from transgression,
O Marye, gentle Marye,
Grant us to share *thy passion*."

“Grant us thy bliss supernal,
O Marye, gentle Marye,
To share, and home eternal.”

“I fain would raise
Life, prayer, and praise,
To thee, *Oh cleanse my soul!*”

“Great faith is mine
In thee, Ladye, in Thee.”

“Star of the sea,
Fountain and spring of light,
That sett’st us free
From all the fears of night;
In misery
I call on thee,
Look down from heaven’s height.”—P. 237.

We must now say a few words about the famous *Scapular*, and as the history of it is very curious, we shall give it as concisely as possible.

The author of the “Short Treatise,” &c., gravely assures us that:—

“The singular prerogatives of this holy Confraternity of the Scapular, above all others, are—First, that it is no human invention, but, as the divines say, *de jure Divino*; having its institution immediately from heaven. Secondly, that it is favoured with the singular protection of the Queen of Heaven, who is the patroness and advocate of this Confraternity. Thirdly, that it hath the promise of eternal salvation. Fourthly, it avails much to abbreviate the expiating flames of purgatory. Finally, ever since its first institution, it hath been favoured by Almighty God with many graces and miracles, inasmuch that by means of the sacred Scapular, the sick hath frequently been restored to their former health, persons bewitched and possessed by the devil have been delivered. Women in travail have been miraculously assisted. This sacred habit also hath appeased violent tempests, when it hath been cast into the sea by those that were in danger. Briefly, it is known by daily experience that the Scapular is a sovereign preservative and remedy against all the evils of this life, both spiritual and temporal; inasmuch that the devils many times have been heard to howl and cry most miserably, saying, *Wo to us, by reason of the sacred Scapular of the Blessed Virgin Mary of Mount Carmel.*”—P. 8.

Now for our history. The most ancient and famous Order of the Blessed Virgin was founded on the Mountain of Carmel about 930 years before the coming of our Saviour! The institutor of it was the great prophet Elias. The little cloud which he saw rising out of the sea signified the Virgin Mary. Wherefore, by express command of Almighty God, he presently began

to institute a religious Order dedicated to her honour. After the death of Elias, Jonas the prophet had the government of the Order. This Jonas was the son of the widow of Sarepta, whom St. Elias restored to life. The present Carmelites, then, are the hereditary successors of these prophets, to which truth Popes Sixtus IV., Julius II., Gregory XIII., and Clement VIII., bore witness in their Bulls, as follows:—

“The sacred Order of the Blessed Virgin Mary of Mount Carmel, which now flourisheth in God’s Church, and the professors of it, are the lawful successors of the holy prophets, Elias and Eliseus.”

In the year 1374 there was a great dispute here in England as to the antiquity of the Carmelites, and their title to be called “brothers and sisters of the Virgin Mary.” For the deciding of this controversy the University of Cambridge deputed several of their number, both D.D.’s and LL.D.’s, amongst whom was John Donwick, Chancellor of the University, and many other eminent and learned persons. After a long and serious examination, they came to the following decision:—

“We have heard the reasons and allegations, and moreover having seen, read, and examined the privileges, chronicles, and ancient writings of the said Order of the Blessed Virgin Mary of Mount Carmel, we pronounce, determine, and declare, (as it is manifested to us by the said histories, and other ancient writings,) that the brothers of this Order are really the imitators and successors of the holy prophets, Elias and Eliseus.—Given at Cambridge, the 23d of February 1371.”

As the Virgin Mary lived only three miles from Carmel, she often visited the holy brotherhood, and gave them her blessing.

In the year 1216 efforts were made by the enemies of the Order to prevent the Pope, Honorius III., from confirming it. But the Virgin appeared to him at night, with a threatening aspect, and told him that what she commanded was not to be contradicted, and that the two persons who opposed the Carmelites should die miserably that night; and, accordingly, the two courtiers were found dead next morning.

In the year 1245, St. SIMON STOCK was chosen General of the Order. This holy man was born in Kent in 1163. When he was twelve years old he withdrew himself to a wood, where he lived in the trunk of a hollow oak, fed by herbs, and sometimes bread, which a friendly dog brought him in his mouth, especially on festival days—for the said dog paid devout attention to the calendar. He was called thence to the Generalship of the Carmelites. The Virgin appeared to him on one occasion when he received the holy Scapular from her hands in the manner following:—

“As he was upon his knees in the oratory, the most glorious Vir-

gin, environed with celestial splendour in the company of many thousands of angels, appeared to him, and holding the sacred Scapular in her hand, she said to him these words:—*Receive, most beloved Son, the Scapular of thy Order, a sign of my Confraternity, a privilege both to thee and to all Carmelites, in which he that dieth shall not suffer eternal fire; behold the sign of salvation, a safeguard in danger, the covenant of peace, and everlasting alliance.*”

This happened on the 16th July 1251, in the Carmelite Convent at Cambridge, which, like that in London, bore the name of White Friars, so called because of the white upper garment generally worn by the fraternity.

Pope John XXII., of blessed memory, was a great friend of the Carmelites, and conferred many privileges upon their Order. But they were sometimes persecuted. The people of Chester, in 1317, took great offence at their calling themselves “brothers of the Virgin Mary.” After being visited with sundry plagues for their unbelief, they were convinced of their error thus:—The Abbot, who was governor of the city, ordered that a solemn procession should be made to appease God’s wrath. In this procession marched the Carmelite Fathers, who, in passing a wooden image of the Virgin, bowed down their heads, saying “Ave Maria.” The statue returned the salutation, and stretching forth a finger, which before was doubled, pronounced three times with a distinct voice, “Behold, these are my brothers.”

The privileges bestowed by the Popes on those who wore the Scapular are almost innumerable. Among its pontifical benefactors are reckoned John XXII., Clement VII., Pius V., Gregory XIII. Paul V. bestowed upon them, on the performance of certain very easy conditions, no less than eight indulgences, half of them plenary. Nearly all the conditions have reference to the honour of the Virgin. Many other Popes have given the most marked proofs of their favour to this Order.

“Besides so many indulgences, the see apostolic hath granted another favour to the brothers and sisters of this Confraternity, which is, that they may be absolved once in this life, and also at their death, from all excommunications, censures, and cases, reserved to the Roman bishops, and from others as often as they please, by any confessor approved by the ordinary.

“Finally, Clement VII., who granted the former privilege to the devout of the Scapular, hath granted to all persons who would bestow an alms, though ever so small, upon any of our churches, convents, or religious, that they may be partakers of *all* the prayers, suffrages, masses, alms, pilgrimages, and penances, which for that time shall be done throughout the *whole church.*”

The Scapular must be made of cloth serge or other stuff, but not of silk, though it may be lined with silk. The reason of this

is that the Virgin never wore silk, but woollen, and that of the native colour.

“The Scapular is to be worn continually day and night, and never to be taken off till death; also, it is good to be buried with it. The brothers and sisters may wear it about their necks, not in their pockets, or in their girdle, nor folded in their breasts, for it being a Scapular must be worn in the form of a Scapular; that is to say, a vest, or habit, that hangs over the shoulders.”

Ludicrously false as is this story of the Scapular, the whole superstructure of the worship of Mary rests on no better foundation. It is as baseless as anything in the *Arabian Nights' Entertainments*, though the credit of the Church of Rome is pledged for its truth. The proposition that it is the will of Christ that no sort of religious worship should be paid to Mary, or to any creature, is capable of perfect demonstration.

The doctrine of “one Mediator” is as clearly laid down in Scripture as the doctrine of one God; and the greatest care seems taken to represent Jesus as so gracious, compassionate, sympathizing, and accessible, that no intercessor could be desired beside Him. How any one can read his own discourses, the references of the Apostles to his Priesthood, and particularly the Epistle to the Hebrews, and still think another advocate needed, is most marvellous.

Never was a perversion of Christianity so little countenanced by the letter of the Word of God. Common sense should have taught men that a creature cannot be everywhere at the same time to hear prayers, or be able to answer them, even if the notion seemed to have received encouragement from the Great Teacher. But when we reflect that Scripture and reason are in perfect harmony on the subject—that the Saviour absolutely condemned and carefully guarded against any approaches to the Mother of his Humanity in connexion with our redemption, we cannot but regard her worship, existing for so many centuries, and spread over so large a portion of Christendom, as a proof of fearfully strong delusion.

Three of the evangelists mention Mary in the course of their history. But Paul, who so fully expounds the Christian system, and especially dwells upon the work of mediation, never once mentions her name in all his Epistles; neither does James, or Jude, or Peter, though they must all have known her personally. Her death even is not referred to by them. The most extraordinary and suggestive circumstance of all is, that John, though his own Gospel teaches that she was intrusted to his care, does not allude to her in any of his Epistles or in the Revelation. This seems to be the result of a settled purpose. That she was honoured as the mother of the Lord, and regarded as

"blessed among women,"—highly favoured or graciously accepted, (not "full of grace," as the Vulgate has it,)—all true Protestants cheerfully admit. But they dare not go farther.

Only *three* addresses are recorded as having been made by our Lord to his blessed Mother; and these are certainly very remarkable and in no way reconcilable with the Roman Catholic doctrine. The first was in answer to the remonstrance of Mary—"Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? Thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing." Jesus makes no distinction between Joseph and her in his reply, nor does he recognise, but rather repudiate, the "authority of a mother" in his "Father's business." "Know ye not."

His next words to her are in the same spirit. They were uttered at the wedding in Cana,—"*Woman*, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come." Epiphanius, on the Collyridian heresy, says that the word "*woman*" was used here designedly to prevent Christians from regarding her with excessive admiration. It is singular that in all the New Testament we do not read that He ever said *to her* "*my mother*." When others mentioned her to Him, He asked "Who is my mother?" "And stretching forth his hand towards his disciples, he said—Behold my mother and my brethren; for whosoever shall do the will of my Father who is in Heaven, the same is my brother and sister and mother;" or, as Luke expresses it, "My mother and my brethren are those which hear the word of God and keep it." Here there is no exaltation of Mary as the Empress of the Universe, but something which forbids the very idea of the least pre-eminence over other disciples on the mere ground of her maternity. This is still more distinctly taught us afterwards, when he says—"Yea, *rather* blessed are they which hear the word of God and keep it."—(*Mat.* xii. 46; *Luke* viii. 21; xi. 27.)

The third occasion on which our Lord spoke to his mother was when he hung upon the cross. "When Jesus therefore saw his mother and the disciple standing by whom he loved, he said unto his mother, *Woman*, behold thy Son; then said he to the disciple, Behold thy mother." Here were calm authority and heart-touching filial tenderness in the midst of his agony, but not a word or a hint to countenance the idea that he hereby constituted her the "mother of all the faithful," as her worshippers fondly dream. The reader will remark that not even in this parting scene, so fitted to bring out natural affection in all its force and tenderness, does he call her his mother. What an effort it must have required in him (humanly speaking) to repress his merely human feeling, in order to guard against abuse!

We have now to advert to another fact which cannot be re-

conciled to the doctrine of the Mariolaters. After the resurrection, our Lord remained forty days on earth, conversing with his disciples, during which time we have no mention of the Virgin, though many of his interviews and conversations with the disciples are recorded, and three other Marys are mentioned by name, one of them being Magdalene. The Virgin is not mentioned at all in connexion with the *ascension*, and only on one solitary occasion subsequently, (Acts i. 13.) During the sixty years comprehended in the New Testament history, from the ascension to the writing of the Apocalypse, this so-called "Queen of Heaven,"—this "only way of access to the Saviour,"—this "exclusive channel of his grace," is never mentioned. No souls are saved by her intercession—no miracles are wrought by her power. John, to whose care she had been intrusted, never refers to her at all. We have no record of her death—no account of the place of her burial; all which it is impossible to reconcile by any ingenuity with the doctrines of the Church of Rome on the subject. In fact, her worshippers have been obliged to invent a history of their idol, which, by its contrasted absurdity, serves strongly to confirm the veracity of the Evangelical history of our Lord.

As soon as Mariolatry got a public recognition in the Church, it spread rapidly. It is easy to account for this fact. The Church had widely departed from the faith; the clouds of the apostasy overspread Christendom; the Scriptures were not read; the people were grossly ignorant, as were also the priests and monks; the minds of the most learned among them were ruled by an unchecked credulity, and a passion for the marvellous. Besides this, the multitudinous converts from heathenism, baptized without being instructed, suffered to retain their old customs and festivals under Christian names, felt naturally an irresistible craving for the seductive *Goddess-worship* of their former state. The "Queen of Heaven" came in to fill up this void in their hearts. Then were gradually transferred to Christianity even the loves of Olympus. The Eternal Father became a husband, and Mary his reigning spouse; at another time she was married to the Holy Ghost. The beauty and softness of her sex operated on the hearts of her worshippers—inspiring a familiar confidence, which often degenerated into a very questionable feeling.

We are told by Alban Butler, (vol. viii. p. 175,) that the Assumption of the Virgin Mary is the greatest of all the festivals which the Church celebrates in her honour; "the consummation of all the other great mysteries by which her life was rendered most wonderful." For this, then, at all events, there ought to be some foundation in history. When she fixes upon the 15th of August, and says—"To-day Mary the Virgin ascended

the heavens. Rejoice, because she is reigning with Christ for ever"—she ought to have some authority for the assertion. We have seen that there is no such authority in Scripture. The Apostolic Fathers, the ancient creeds and councils, all the Fathers for five hundred years, are silent on the subject; and nowhere during this purest period of the Church's history, can any proof be found that the Virgin Mary was worshipped, or her invocation sought, but everything to exclude the notion of such an intrusion upon the functions of the one Mediator.

To fiction, fraud, dishonest interpolation, and fabricated miracles, Mariolatry has been indebted for its prevalence from first to last. Their earliest authority is a supposed entry in the *Chronicon* of Eusebius opposite the year 48, in these words:—"Mary the Virgin, the mother of Jesus, was taken up into heaven, as some write that it has been revealed to them."

Supposing these to be the genuine words of Eusebius, what do they prove? A chronologist in the fourth century, referring to an occurrence alleged to have taken place three hundred years before, says that some persons, whom he does not name, said that it was *revealed* to them that Mary was taken up into heaven. The necessity of this imaginary revelation is the most satisfactory proof that history and tradition were silent on the subject. But the passage is now acknowledged to be a *palpable interpolation*. The Catholic editor of the *Chronicon* at Bourdeaux, A.D. 1604, (p. 566,) "tells us that he was restrained from expunging it only because nothing certain as to the Assumption of the Virgin could be substituted in its place!"—(Tyler, p. 101.)

After relating at length the ridiculous story of Mary's resurrection, Mr. Tyler sums up the evidence thus:—

"A writer near the middle of the *sixth* century refers to a conversation said to have taken place a hundred years before; in which, at Constantinople, the Bishop of Jerusalem is said to have informed the Emperor of an ancient tradition concerning a miraculous event nearly four hundred years before;—that the body of Mary was taken out of the coffin without the knowledge of those who deposited it there, whilst the primitive and inspired account, (recording most minutely the journeys and proceedings of some of those very persons, before and subsequently to the supposed event, and the letters of others,) makes no mention at all of any transaction of the kind; and of all the intermediate historians and writers of every character, not one gives the slightest intimation that any rumour of it had ever reached them."—P. 111.

The fabulous tradition crept along the ground for a long time; but in the Middle Ages, the monks sent it forth into the world full fledged.

It is a melancholy fact, that the most respectable divines of

the present day in the Church of Rome, do not hesitate to quote passages in favour of their doctrines, as the most decisive authorities, knowing them to be false. This sort of dishonesty taints the whole religious literature of that Church. They seem to think it perfectly innocent. We make this remark with pain, but we make it deliberately, being obliged to advert to one glaring instance of it, in connexion with our subject. Bellarmin quotes a homily ascribed to Athanasius, in which there is a prayer to the Virgin, and gives it as a proof that the great champion of orthodoxy invoked the Mother of Jesus. Yet when pronouncing his judgment on the different works assigned to Athanasius, he condemns the treatise containing this homily as *a forgery*, declaring the evidence against it to be irresistible! Ever since Bellarmin, it has been excluded from the works of Athanasius, and condemned by the most strenuous defenders of the Church of Rome. The Benedictine Editors in 1698 classed it among the spurious works ascribed to him. They begin their preface thus:—"That this discourse is spurious, *there is no learned man that does not now adjudge.*" They prove from the style and other internal evidence, that it must have been written three hundred years after the time of Athanasius.

"And yet," says Mr. Tyler, "after the utter repudiation of the whole homily, as a work falsely attributed to Athanasius; after its unqualified condemnation by Bellarmin; after the Benedictine Editors have declared that there was no learned man that did not adjudge it to be spurious, the forgery being self-condemned by evidence clearer than the sun; after Baronius has expressed his assurance that all *learned men desirous of the truth* would agree with him in pronouncing it to be spurious—after all this, we find it *quoted in evidence* as the genuine work of Athanasius, in the middle of the nineteenth century, without the faintest shadow of an allusion to the combined judgment by which it has been condemned, or even to any suspicion ever having been entertained of its being a forgery."—P. 170.

The author referred to is no less a personage than the Right Rev. Dr. WISEMAN, recently appointed by the Pope, Bishop of the Metropolis, and well known to be the most distinguished champion of Romanism in the United Kingdom—an accomplished scholar and an eloquent writer. Could he be ignorant that he was deceiving his readers? He refers to a work as the production of Athanasius, (Serm. in Annunt. tom. ii. p. 401,) the irrefutable proof of whose spuriousness "is drawn out at large by the Benedictine Editors in the *very edition and identical volume* of the works of Athanasius to which Dr. Wiseman refers for his authority when he quotes the passage as genuine!"—(Dr. Wiseman's Lectures, vol. ii. p. 108. London, Booker, 1836. See also Berrington and Kirk, pp. 430, 431.)

There are many other instances in which Dr. Wiseman has been convicted by Mr. Tyler, the Rev. W. Palmer, and others, of adducing quotations in evidence which betray either the most unaccountable ignorance or the most culpable fraud. But in such a case ignorance would be not merely disgraceful, it would be highly blameworthy.

There are, let us believe, multitudes whom the worship of the Virgin Mary restrains from vice, not because she hears their prayers or endows them with grace. They associate her with Christ, and behold her in his reflected glory; and although, in all cases, she withdraws attention from HIM, and weakens or destroys faith in his all-sufficient mediation, yet the influence of her example, in many cases, may be favourable to virtue. It operates in the manner of hero-worship. Just as the image of a beloved mother departed, eminent for wisdom, goodness, and sanctity, when kept constantly before the mind, will lead to admiration and imitation, and to a horror of those things which she hated—so is it here. There are *living* idols that excite a similar influence on their worshippers. Still this is a frail support of virtue. It is but imaginative and sentimental. It wants the strength of principle; and, above all, it wants the sustaining influence of Divine Grace.

ART. IV.—*Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Settlement and Poor Removal. May, 1847.*

WHEN, thirteen years ago, the whole subject of the English Poor Law was brought under the notice of the Legislature, in the discussion on the Amendment Act introduced on the Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry, the question of Settlement was necessarily, though perhaps only incidentally, considered. The long list of decisions in the Court of Queen's Bench, which governed the practical administration of the law—always complicated, often apparently inconsistent—the never-ending litigation which a fresh adjudication upon new matters seemed to entail upon the Court, the parishes, and the counties, appear to have weighed with the Commissioners in recommending, and with Parliament in adopting, the abolition of some of the former modes by which a settlement was acquired. From this simplification of the law, very beneficial effects immediately began to flow; orders of removal, refusals to receive, appeals against them—all the various weapons of offence which parishes respectively possessed for the purpose of satisfying the combativeness of a pugnacious overseer, and for tormenting their paupers and each other—appeared to be laid up in dust and rust. The amount of money expended in litigation of this kind has been reduced to little more than £9000 a-year, from an average of three times that sum.

In dealing, however, with a matter so extensive and intricate as the English Poor Law then was—having regard, too, to the critical circumstances in which it was brought forward—it may be doubted whether all parts of what was generally an useful, bold, and skilful act of legislation, received from Parliament all the examination which the greatness of the change required. The time, perhaps, was not altogether most favourable for it. We had just passed the Parliamentary Reform Bill, after one of the greatest struggles and the strongest exhibitions of the national will experienced since the Revolution. In the autumn of the year which witnessed the change of administration—in 1830, the social condition of the labouring class in many parts of the south of England, manifesting itself in tumult in some instances, inspired the greatest uneasiness and disquietude. The measures of relief to the destitute, recommended by the original Commission of Inquiry, were mostly directed to check the abuses which, in this most corrupt form, had partly caused, certainly aggravated these disorders, and had also, but in a mitigated degree, crept into portions of the north; and when we consider the mass of evil and demoralization that then prevailed, the number of per-

sons—not all of them paupers, or with the excuse of ignorance—interested, under the disguise of “friendship for the poor,” in keeping up these abuses, and the mass of conflicting evidence which they digested, we are forced to wonder, not that there should have been errors in the remedial propositions, but that the errors should have borne so small a proportion to the great mass of legislation which the Report suggested. But errors to a certain extent there undoubtedly were; and among these, not the least were their modes of dealing with settlement. Birth, marriage, parentage, renting a tenement, payment of parochial rates, and estate, remain, but apprenticeship was much restricted, and hiring and service entirely abolished. This last was the great source and cause of the acquisition of parish settlement so long as it lasted. It appears that the policy of the old system, or rather the additions to it, whether engrafted on it from time to time by the Legislature, or arising from judge-made law, was to favour the acquisition of settlement; while the Act of 1834, on the contrary, forbade it. It had, however, of course, often been previously the interest of parish officers and occupiers to evade and defeat the law: a hiring for a whole year conferred a settlement; it became the custom then to engage servants in husbandry for a less period, as from old Michaelmas-day till new. But then these evasions were not always successful; frequent litigation ensued, and formed so large an item in the aggregate expenditure of poor-rates, that the Commission of Inquiry in 1833, in their anxiety to reduce expenses, and thus render as palatable as might be to the country the great changes they were about to recommend, not only reduced the modes of acquiring a settlement, but suggested that Unions, when formed, should be one parish, for the purpose of rating and settlement. Doubtless, such an arrangement would have had the advantage of simplicity of account, economy of management, absence of litigation, (as between parish and parish of the same Union,) and equality of payment. The anomaly of a parish, A, in which the rates were 4s. 6d. in the pound, while over the hedge, or across the stream, in B, they were only 1s. 6d. or 2s., would have given way to a uniform rate of taxation. But this *primâ facie* advantage would, there is too much reason to apprehend, be balanced by a large amount of mischief and carelessness, the inevitable result of the diminution of the immediate and individual liability which now stimulates the rate-payers, each in his own area, to use his best endeavours to lessen the amount and diminish the incidence of pauperism. And though equality of taxation for the *general* purposes of the realm, is one of the first and most essential conditions of a just form of government, it may be observed that a poor-rate never has partaken of this character—it is, on the contrary, purely *local*. The State has from time to

time ordained that the wealth (and of a particular kind only) of certain persons living in certain districts should maintain the poverty they comprised, without troubling itself as to the rate of charge. It was fully recognised, also, at the time of the discussion alluded to, in the speeches in Parliament, and in the documents of the Commissioners of Inquiry, and in the language of those who, before or since, have treated this subject, that the amount and degree of pauperism, were much the consequence of the conduct and system pursued by parochial authorities—that a just, firm, and liberal dealing with the labourer, in some way or other, prevented the degeneration of the class into pauperism; whilst a careless and corrupt administration rapidly and indefinitely increased it.

It was also supposed (by the more sanguine) that once enlightened as to their true interests, all parties—landlords, manufacturers, farmers, operatives, and labourers, would respectively find their advantage in steering clear of the old abuses, and persevering steadily in the course of amendment. And to some extent this did ensue; but not universally, nor without a great struggle in particular parts, where strong local connexion, or firmly-rooted corruption, were stout enough to withstand the reform.

Unfortunately for the success of the measure—indeed for the arriving at sound conclusions in a matter of such vital importance to the whole of our social fabric—from the very first it has served as a battle-field for political partisans on each side. The leaders themselves of neither of the great parties have been guilty of resorting to this unworthy warfare; but the subordinates have made up for their lack of importance, by their declamations to attract out-door favour and notoriety. Their views and sincerity will in time come to be appreciated, if they are not so already, at their just value. This busy appetite for popular applause has led to constant—we wish we could add, harmless—attempts to impair or improve the principle laid down in 1834. Sometimes the allowance in aid of children, more often the bastardy clauses, lastly those of the impotent and infirm—the education, growth, exercise, and recreation of the rising broods of pauper children, have exercised the patience of the House of Commons. It was then no wonder if, among a number of gentlemen, pledged, as many of them were, to their constituents, to do something to make its operation less distasteful, desirous as they were of doing nothing seriously to injure the measure which in their hearts they loved, yet compelled to redeem their pledges, in which they had professed their hate—in circumstances so curious, it is not surprising if a constant meddling by committees or by Acts of Parliament has taken place. Many of these inquiries were really not worth the time that was bestowed upon them, even if we did not set a high value on the time of those eminent

legislators who were members of the committees; still there were some marked anomalies which deservedly attracted the notice of Parliament—settlement most so.

Orders of removal had, in the first two or three years that followed the operation of the Amendment Act, very much diminished, as had all the law expenses consequent thereon. But that period was one of general abundance of agricultural productions and of manufacturing prosperity; mills were built; labourers from the overstocked rural districts were invited to migrate with their families into the seats of the sister industry. In 1841–1842, however, the flood-tide had reached its height, the current changed, the ebb began, and has more or less prevailed since. As the demand for labour in the factory districts lessened, and at length ceased, the immigrants who had been induced to settle there were thrown out of work, and in due time appeared as claimants of relief in the manufacturing township, which, seeing no prospect of a revival of business, removed the applicants to their original settlements. For in the three or four years—nay, in the thirty or forty—that an individual might have resided in Ashton or Manchester—much as he might have enriched it with his labour, and contributed to the rising fortunes of an Ashworth, or a Greg, or Bright—he acquired in his old age or destitution no claim on any class of contributors, save on those of his birth-place, which he had renounced to take suit and service with the lords of industry. On a reverse, on any defeat sustained by them, they disbanded their army—he was sent back—

“ Pellitur, maternos
In sinu ferens Deos,
Et Uxor, et Vir, sordidosque natos.”

He and his squalid children! How exact the picture drawn by the poet of the Augustine age of a removal 2000 years ago! When, then, it was found the parties were returned on hand in considerable numbers, unfitted from their past in-door occupations for the ordinary rude labour in the open air, which was all that could be offered to them in the agricultural localities to which they were severally sent back, it was natural that a feeling of the injustice of such an infliction, and a wish to relieve themselves from its burden, should have actuated the communities so treated. The burden of pauperism thus cast upon them was not of their own creation, nor could it by any amount of vigilance and forethought on their part, have been lessened or forestalled; and every one will admit that to make one class of persons, inhabiting certain limits, pecuniarily liable for the extent of pauperism engendered, not by any extravagance or illiberality of their own, but by the improvidence and speculation of other

and wealthy persons and establishments, living at a distance, exempt themselves from responsibility for the pauperism their proceedings might produce, was a fit occasion for remonstrance and interference. The result was the 9th and 10th Vict. cap. 66, commonly called the Poor Removal Act; the main feature of which was, that an industrial residence of five years in any one parish, though it did not confer a settlement, was to prevent the removal of an applicant for relief.

We need not enter into the various anomalous provisions with which it was clogged or fenced in its passage through Parliament, and which have conferred upon it so motley a character as to render it unintelligible to boards of guardians, and not very clear to the Poor Law Commissioners themselves. There does appear to us to have been a capital error in the framing of the Act, in not making the towns, especially the manufacturing towns, one parish, for the purposes contemplated in it. We presume it was intended as an act of justice and relief to those parishes whose labourers, having consumed their manhood and strength in distant parts, are sent back worn out, and incapable of earning a pittance, to be maintained by the rate-payers of their native place, for the rest of their days. The natural operation of this Act, had it been so contrived as to realize the first intentions of its framers, would probably have been to fix this charge rather more on the towns than the country. In order, however, to effect this, it should have been an essential part of the Bill that the collective town, and not the individual parishes composing it, should have been rendered liable for an industrial residence within its precincts. That residence is so often interrupted in many of the ancient towns containing a large number of parishes, as Norwich and Bristol, that practically an operative might have resided in them twenty or thirty years, without having been domiciled for a year consecutively in any one of their numerous parishes. The effect of the law during the few months it had been in operation was such as to cause from some townships, that felt themselves aggrieved from the fresh burdens thus cast upon them, petitions for relief and alteration; and, in the course of the last session, a Committee of the House of Commons, of which Mr. Charles Buller was chairman, investigated the matter. They were said to be divided in opinion as to the proper remedy to be applied to the alleged defects in the Act of 1846,—some favouring a general union-rating and settlement; others adhering to the parochial division. At any rate, no report beyond the evidence was given; and we have therefore no clear intimation of their views.

Several of the witnesses examined before them spoke very strongly of the inequality of the present rates, and of the great injustice inflicted by close parishes on their more open neigh-

bours. A close parish is understood to be one belonging only to one or two proprietors, and where a systematic destruction of cottages has been designedly carried on for some years, until the labourers are dislodged and quartered upon adjoining townships, in such habitations as they can obtain, and which are often at a considerable distance from their usual work. This exemption, however, from the poor-rate, is not always an unmixed benefit. Some of the witnesses state, that the labourers who have thus to tramp two, three, or four miles, out and home to their work each day, are worth nearly as many shillings per week less to their employer, from the consumption of animal power on the road. Now, at 1s. 6d. per week depreciation, this is nearly £4 per annum for each man; and if we assume that each 100 acres will, on the average, employ three men, whose wages will amount to £100 per annum, here is a loss to the occupier on his labour account of £12, as a set off against his presumed saving of rates. Suppose his 100 acres are assessed at £1 per acre, his loss on his labour account is equivalent to a rate of 2s. 4d. in the pound; so that, unless the banishment of a portion of the natural population effects a saving of at least 2s. 4d. in the pound on what he would otherwise have to pay, he is a loser by the arrangement, giving up, on the one hand, more than he realizes on the other. It is clear, therefore, that however desirable it may be in the abstract, to keep down rates by the absence of population, still, there is soon found in practice a limit beyond which the attempt defeats itself; and assuming that a landlord had all the horror of population and pauperism imputed to him by some of the witnesses who appeared before the Committee, there will still be a point at which his tenant will declare to him that his land is worth so much less rent from the want of men within reach to cultivate it.

We confess that the statements so confidently made and persevered in before the Committee, as to the systematic destruction of cottages, somewhat startled us. For instance, the Rev. F. Peel, rector of Willingham in Lincolnshire, complains of the number of close parishes. He declines, however, to specify them. We had therefore nothing to do but to look carefully over the enumeration abstract of the county at the last census, and compare it with the preceding one of 1831. Out of the 629 villis or parishes which it contains, it appears that 38 are absolutely stationary, having neither more nor fewer habitations within the last decennial period. In 33 parishes they have actually lessened; that is, from 963 houses they have been reduced to 900—a trifling decrease, however, when compared to the whole surface of the country, or even with the one county, in which, by the bye, there has been generally a considerable addition. If there were, however, one part of England rather than another, in which

we could be reconciled to hear of even a decrease of population, it would be in Lincolnshire, where, despite of draining, the fens can never be made inviting, or favourable to human longevity. The whole of the rural economy of that district is arranged, accordingly, to get in the crops with the smallest quantity of indigenous labour, relying on the migratory but regular assistance of Irishmen for the hay and harvest,—(*"Hyems ignava colono,"*)—and as long as such can be had, it appears to be a natural and beneficial arrangement for all parties, by which the number of persons, of necessity exposed to the agues and exhalations of the wintry season, is reduced to a minimum; and such an object will sufficiently account for the slight increase in some parishes, and the actual decrease in others, of habitations, remarked by Mr. Peel.

But Lincolnshire is not the only county; the same systematic destruction is alleged by Mr. Wing to be going on round Bedford. We have examined the returns from the six or eight parishes within a radius of three miles from Bedford, and they contradict Mr. Wing's statement. Goldington in 1831 had 99 houses, in 1841 it had 111; Renhold had increased from 76 to 88; Clapham from 65 to 75; Oakley from 92 to 103; Kempston from 327 to 367; Elstowe from 108 to 112; Biddenham from 59 to 62; Browham had 61 at each period. In these eight parishes, which are chiefly rural, the houses have increased from 887 to 974, or very nearly 11 per cent.; while we are told and expected to believe that systematic depopulation is going on round Bedford. The town itself has increased still more.

The statements are quite as sweeping as to Reading. Mr. Chadwick upon this point is quite positive, and thinks he could prove it by means of witnesses. In that case we do not know what is to be said or thought of our population returns; they certainly appear to refute his facts. Round Reading lie (in Berkshire) the parishes of Tilehurst, Caversham, Purley, Pangbourne, and Mapledurham, containing respectively in 1831 and 1841 the following numbers of houses:—Tilehurst, 348-412; Caversham, 260-297; Purley, 35-38; Pangbourne, 139-152; Mapledurham, 102-103. To be quite sure, we looked across the river into Oxfordshire, but neither there can we find a basis for Mr. Chadwick's conclusions. Islip has increased from 135 houses in 1841 to 150; Watlington from 356 to 396; Lower Heyford from 81 to 116; Steeple Aston from 120 to 122. The last, with Mapledurham, showing not a decrease, but only an absence of notable increase; and it is thus demonstrated that the witnesses who spoke so positively to depopulation, have given the reins wholly to their imagination, or have been grossly imposed upon themselves. Whichever be the case, we do but discharge a duty in exposing their mis-statements, and in cautioning the members

of the Legislature from being misled by conclusions founded on such erroneous data.

Many of the functionaries connected with the administration of the Poor Law, in their evidence, proposed more or less to modify or abolish parochial settlement, though there is a remarkable discrepancy in the grounds they severally allege for such a change. Mr. Chadwick is opposed to all settlement, and thinks it would be a general advantage to both labourers and rate-payers if it were swept away. (2042.) He would only retain even an Union settlement, from deference to prejudices which he thinks not well founded. Mr. William Foster, an attorney at Swindon, is for an equal national rate—thinks that for England one of 1s. 6d. in the pound on £75,000,000 of real property, (no matter whether extra-parochial or otherwise now exempt,) would be sufficient; but he allows that great care must be taken with the general administration, that the gross mismanagement—that old abuses might not again be introduced. Then we hear Mr. Hotson, an auditor under the Poor Law, equally experimental, without any scruples as to the burdening the parishes in totally new and different proportions, not caring what may have been the previous difference in rates, owing to their good or ill management. This witness thinks all will right itself—that the best workman will by competition obtain the best situation and the highest wages. We daresay he may, but about the lower and weaker men he is not so explicit. When pressed upon the point, he says something about migration, which we cannot quite understand; being still of opinion that the weakest and poorest will be sadly deteriorated in condition when the rate-payers are personally freed from the pecuniary responsibility of employing them.

Mr. Gulson, an official Poor Law Commissioner, although he is for a change in the law, and an abolition of parochial settlement, is nevertheless at issue with Mr. Chadwick, on the disadvantage to the labourer and its effects on his character. (1251.) The fear of removal may have kept people from applying improperly for relief, but they now (since the change in 1846) doubtless do apply for it, which they would not have done before, (1268,) since the immovability created by the 9 and 10 Vict. cap. 66.

Mr. Meadows White, a solicitor, would come by degrees to an equal pound rate all over the Unions. The steps by which he would arrive at this appear to us open to grave objections; we will suppose them overcome. But then Mr. White, aware of the laxity of administration by ordinary boards of guardians—*i. e.* of occupying farmers, &c.—would not trust them with the main part of the control; they would do well enough for the aged and impotent, but for the able-bodied, he would have another board, consisting of *ex officio* guardians, chairmen and vice-chairmen

Unions—a body, in short, substantially resembling the heritors in Scotland; essentially differing from the ordinary guardians in having a permanent interest in the property of the district and the character of the labourers. Mr. White's two boards of guardians (one of which we are certain would be extremely difficult to assemble frequently enough for the important functions cast upon it,) seem a clumsy machinery, besides which his faith in his remedy is founded on what appears to us extremely problematical, viz. an "*improved management giving improved views on the subject.*" We wish we could bring ourselves to believe that the "improved views and management" were courageous enough to stand up successfully against the clamour raised out of doors. But until this is the case, we must decline putting any confidence in Mr. White's sanguine expectations of *ex officio* principle and practice.

Lastly, we must notice Mr. Lumley, one of the Assistant Secretaries of the Poor Law Commission. He approves of the late change in the law, (conferring immovability after five years' industrial residence,) but is not for the abolition of all settlement, with Mr. Chadwick and some others. Such a step, he thinks, would be neither beneficial to the community at large, nor wholly to the poor themselves; because as the power of removal acts as a stimulus to the poor man, it induces industrious exertion on his part to prevent it—take away the stimulus and he becomes inert.

We must own that if that stimulus be removed from both labourer and rate-payer in the agricultural districts, we do not see by what adequate motive it can be replaced in the breast of either. Beginning with the latter: He now knows that in proportion as the population is unemployed it will become chargeable upon the rates to which he is an immediate and direct contributor, and although in many instances he pays dearly for work ill-performed, or which comes to the same thing, employs weak and elderly people to execute work which would be more expeditiously and economically performed by young active men, yet as the former are to be kept alive at his expense, either by wages or a levy of rates, he naturally prefers that form which brings him in *some* though an inadequate return for his outlay. For as rate it would be all lost. But once free him from the pecuniary consequences, on the one hand, of a large mass of unemployed second and third-rate work-people, whom it is not worth his or any body else's while to hire; make him liable only in common with an area twenty times the size of that hitherto chargeable with the result of misconduct or negligence of this sort—bent only on securing to himself the largest return for his expenditure in wages; he will cease to take the interest he is now forced to do in the moral condition and circumstances of the labouring class around him,

beyond that which they might inspire as contributors to his profits under the proposed change. Close parishes have had their abuses, no doubt, but in our haste to animadvert upon and punish their owners, do not let us embrace a wrong principle, merely because we think it a convenient way of revenging ourselves upon them for their previous immunity from taxes grievously burdensome to us. In all the proposed experiments, we certainly see ample provision contemplated for the free circulation, as it is termed, of the best labourers, but no assurance for the maintenance of the condition of the inferior one—inferior, we mean, in health or strength, but not in character. We can readily understand that a London Farmers' Club, and other associations of agriculturists of capital, should be willing to make the most of their expenditure in wages, (which at present they do not,) to employ only the best hands, to obtain the greatest quantity of labour in return for what they pay, and to leave the surplus they have no use for to be provided by rates made on the shopkeepers of the town. They are not called upon to exercise forethought respecting the condition of a class whose whole relations to them would be altered by Mr. Chadwick's abolition of settlement.

After all, the free circulation of labour has practically some limit. We can scarcely imagine the face of the United Kingdom tilled on an enormous migratory gang-system, like some never-ending railway enterprise, by bands of sojourners, camping in huts, just as the work required, and then departing—like Virgil's herdsmen, "*omnia secum armentarius Afer agit tectumque laremque armaque Ancyclæumque canem Cressamque pharetram*"—like enough indeed to some of them in the present day, only that for those uses to which the quiver was put, a bundle of wires for snaring hares is now substituted. These men (see the account of the Castle Acre gang-system in Norfolk) carry about to adjoining neighbourhoods the spectacle of their coarse gross habits, which now shock us so much in those agglomerations of individuals far from home, having neither family-ties, religion, or common interest whatever, save the temporary bargain that enforces their diurnal toil. In effect the free circulation would be confined to single men, that is, if it is to flow with any degree of rapidity. No one imagines that the ordinary labourer can transport himself with wife, family, and household goods, with the facility that the term seems to imply, even if he could count on finding habitation in the districts where his services are in such request. Houses are not so readily manufactured to suit such contingencies. Wherever a demand for labour arises, there will be a corresponding want of houses also, and, as a matter of course, house-rent will rise.

Whatever anomalies the present system may present, we ap-

prehend that greater difficulties would follow from the substitution of *Union* for *Parochial* rating and settlement. Assuming that the stimulus to the poor man has ceased to be an object, that the pressure of individual liability in the smaller area is no longer worth reckoning—how next is the burden to be distributed? Is there to be an union chargeability, with simply a parochial rating?—*i. e.*, that the parishes are to contribute in the same proportions as formerly—one at 1s. 6d., the other at 6s.? or is there to be an equal rate in the pound laid on the whole district at once? Most of the witnesses who recommend the change in its fullest extent, feel the embarrassment of this point. It certainly would be the height of injustice to mulct the well-regulated parish, which by a healthy administration had kept down the rates to 1s. 6d. or 2s., in double that amount, because another in the same Union five or six miles off, had by mismanagement and profusion been burdened with a rate of 6s. Therefore some suggest periodical revision—that whatever may have been for the seven years previous the proportion expended on its poor by parish A, as compared with the gross total of the Union, those proportions should be preserved for contribution, during the next five or seven years, at the end of which a fresh adjustment should take place. It is impossible to deny that there is gross inequality in the incidence of the Poor-rate; but we cannot bring ourselves to see the justice of so attempting to remedy it. The proposal would eventually confound the well-regulated district with the ill-regulated one—extra parochial and all—no matter what amount of exemption might have first tempted a credulous purchaser to give a price calculated in accordance with “an exceedingly low Poor-Rate;” the well-known attraction in Mr. George Robins’ sales by auction of landed property. By the non-removal act, England has already decreed practically that Scotch and Irish paupers, after five years’ residence, must be relieved where they become destitute. Perfect reciprocity will be insisted on: though few English paupers will apply in the two subordinate kingdoms, yet England may with justice require that the administration of the law both in Scotland and Ireland be placed on a footing corresponding to her own. Both countries then are interested in the soundness of the principle adopted in England, from the likelihood of that principle being at no distant period essayed upon them. An Union-rate has most of the disadvantages of a Parish-rate, without the evenness of a national one. An Union-rating and settlement may involve a charge of 2s. in one Union, and 5s. in another; that is, the same inequalities of taxation with fewer securities for good management and economic expenditure. A national rate would at least be just though inexpedient; for if the ordaining of the expenditure be vested as now in boards of guardians, with an occupation qualifi-

cation only—nay, even with a board of heritors or landlords, we should fear the tendency to profusion would be greater than to frugality, unless the state reserved to itself a more active and authoritative interference to prevent waste than it assumed under the former régime. With either a National or an Union-rating, stock in trade in England should be made to contribute, as do means and substance in Scotland. Every man would then have an interest in the proper administration of the law, and would not willingly see it used for unworthy purposes, or its proceeds bestowed on undeserving objects. This at present is wanting: so long as one species of property remains liable, it will account for the apathy with which those who were not possessed of such property, beheld or encouraged the profusion of which *it* and *not they* bore the cost; and the obloquy so shamefully directed against those upright and courageous men who reduced within more moderate dimensions, the hideous mass of pauperism, by which this country was wellnigh overwhelmed.

There is, however, less objection in principle to the formation of towns comprising many parishes—particularly if manufacturing—into one, for the purpose of rating and settlement. In the country we rely on one set of motives, safe-guards, and checks—there is what Lord Brougham happily termed the patriarchal feeling, which in the midst of the rural ignorance in which it is displayed, makes up for the want of that enterprise and progress that marks the town. Relieve the country employers and proprietors of this, and you would at once have to provide for a large floating mass of agricultural idleness, which would be expelled from its present sites—compelled to give way to more skilled labour which would come in and supersede it. But in a town the case is otherwise. The population is necessarily recruited by the influx from the country, and without such external aid we do not believe—unless in the more healthy ones—that reproduction would go on, so that the numbers from the indigenous population could be maintained. It is the constant flow of activity and energy, often doubtless interrupted by “strikes,” and manufacturing depressions and stoppages, but as often recovering from them, by means of the onward tendency of art and civilization, almost irrespective of the efforts of individual masters. The latter are powerless against a current, though their united endeavours may sometimes give it a direction and turn; and while in the country individual will and exertion must be looked to, for acting on the supply of labour, and preventing its accumulation—in the town the general principle will accomplish every thing—mere private effort nothing.

ART. V.—1. *The White Cut*. Illustrated by J. W. Edinburgh, 1848.

2. *Fortunio*. Illustrated by J. W. Edinburgh, 1848.

3. *Our Street*. By W. M. THACKERAY. London, 1848.

WE must not confine our Christmas literature to carols. The great annual era has not only its social, but also its sacred associations; and mingling with all its becoming tones of merriment may be other and more solemn strains. But still, as Christmas claims its carol as by birthright, why should not Criticism have a carol of its own? The mistletoe, as fitly as the birch, may be his emblem, who alternately caresses and chastises the offspring of human intellect. Unquestionably there comes once a year, a season when everybody really is, or tries or pretends to be, more than usually hilarious and happy. A glorious old poet, with his eye and his heart full of the bright and beautiful Ægean, sings of the "incalculable laughing of the waves." Oh musical and untranslatable Greek words! How exquisite and instantly perceptible is their imagery! We have so seen and heard the sea a hundred times, rippling, gurgling, dimpling, twinkling with the perpetual play of myriads of diamond sparkles, which were so plainly the laughter of the waters, that we have been fain to hold our sides with our hands, and laugh back again to the cheerful, sunshiny face of the Great Deep. And laughing away it was, and often will be, as if all that lay below its surface were speckless pebbles, and pure sands, without any dull weeds, or slimy shapes, or dismal wrecks. Thus too we might speak of the aspect of manhood, womanhood, and childhood, in the latter days of December and the earliest days of January, when a confluent hurricane of chuckling shakes harmoniously the rotundity of the terrestrial planet. Shall the critic alone sulkily despise or coldly escape the infection of general merriment? Many gentle thoughts and wise purposes should utterly forbid in him any such grim invulnerability.

It is impossible to despise the good humour of the New Year holidays. For there is at that time a store of virtue, as we look upon them, in toys and tarts, in pantomimes and plum-puddings. Nor can it possibly be the case, that the frank joyousness, the kindly and neighbourly cordiality, gleaming and ringing for ten days round about us on every side, melt all away, like snow-flakes in the river, and leave no trace behind them. The prattle of so many children does not pass quite into empty air and nothingness. The companionship is not unprofitable which, for a few hours, so playfully yet so earnestly intertwines the

white hairs of the grandsire, with the sunny ringlets of the youngest of his race; the silver and the golden chords, stirred by the breathings of the same innocent gaiety, fill our habitations with music, of which the echoes cling to the hearth-stones, and linger among the rafters. In the intercourse of riper age, also, bearded men, in spite of themselves, crush and stifle many rough and bitter things, beneath the closer, warmer pressure with which hands are then grasped. Hannibal softened mountains with vinegar. The sweeter potency of a Christmas laugh has often melted the heart of man—harder than an Alp, more rugged than an Apennine. The cackle, perhaps, of a Christmas goose has sometimes saved the capitol of a man's soul from a Gallic invasion of bad passions. This is not a mirth to be despised.

Christmas being, in fact, annually a great era, should, like any other great era, possess a peculiar literature, imbued with a predominating spirit, and marked by characteristic features. Hence it is that, from misty antiquity down to the present hour, fairy tales and harlequinades have absorbed the general poetry, the romance, and the drama, (for there is not, properly speaking, any prose,) of this jovial epoch. The phalanx of Elizabethan tragedians, who hurled forth with tremendous and unprecedented energy, desperate impulses, daring fancies, and gloomy ruminations, have been considered to forebode as well as to fore-run the volcanic hurly-burly of the Great Rebellion. The cohort of comic wits, who flouted modesty and flaunted their licentiousness in the glare of the Restoration, have been thought to reflect faithfully the temporary effervescence of that national intoxication. But these mirrors fling back feeble and crooked copies, when tested beside the clear and vigorous images daquerreotyped by the literature of Christmas. For, then "motley's the only wear," and our waxen tempers yield to the impress of the grotesque and the eccentric. We are prepared to witness and to play fantastic tricks of all sorts in all quarters. Our imagination shapes the whole external world to suit the dimensions and the colours of its caprice. We do not mean that during a particular fortnight, a giant seems to be so many feet taller, or a dwarf to be so many inches more lowly in stature, or that the roar of a lion in a caravan is more dreadful, or that the canvass of a panorama is more intensely like a line-of-battle ship or a squadron of French Cuirassiers, than at any other time. But we mean that giants and dwarfs, and tents redolent of hyænas or Bengal tigers, and the peristrepthic thunders of the bombardments of Algiers, are to be taken as the representatives of the people, and places, and noises with which, for a particular fortnight, it may be our whimsical pleasure to fill the earth. These, and such as these, be-

come to us, for a limited period, society, nature, and history. We lay it down as a canon of Christmas criticism, that there is a boundless prairie of imagination where the Pegasus of Christmas literature may scamper and disport itself to the infinite delectation of multitudes more countless than those whose plaudits were wont to shake the imperial fabric of the Colosseum, or to drown the uproar of two seas at the Corinthian Isthmus.

Even in the prairie, however, the critic with a silken lasso may reach Pegasus. Because there is one absolutely essential element, without which, in our obstinate opinion, a book may usurp the name of, but certainly is not, and never can be, a Christmas Book. A true Christmas Book must leave its reader, when he finishes it, prodigiously and perfectly happy. Its last word should be a signal for us involuntarily, irrepressibly, and as if we could hail without a speaking-trumpet the whole human race, high and low, rich and poor, young and old—to shout out “A Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year!” Whatever may be the path by which we travel, the goal to which we come must be in open, gladsome, glorious sunshine. There may be, here and there, gloomy scenery and dirty weather; a tear now and then may fall, or a gush of weeping break forth; and anger at intervals may quicken the pulse and kindle the eye, all without any blame on the part of the writer, if only he ends the journey under a clear sky and with a jocund heart. But, as a finale, the welkin must resound with the happiness of everybody. Otherwise, we can but assure the lugubrious gentleman or lady who shall prefer to wind up a tale with a melancholy catastrophe, that what has been so written may be read by us when merry Christmas-tide is over—but not till then.

There are, to be sure, probably solemn philosophers who are perplexed by a theory which makes jollity rule so autocratically over any literature, who cannot comprehend in what way knowledge (dry, dusty, heavy knowledge, which is everything with them) shall be able to alter its specific gravity, as it has been fixed by them, and continue still to be knowledge. It is difficult to deal with this solidity and ponderousness of wisdom, except playfully to scourge it. Such sages would be equally puzzled by many other problems. Why? Because they will not allow themselves to look with open eyes in broad daylight upon the whole truth, being contented beneath the glimmering uncertainty of the lamp in their chamber to glance at half the truth, or the quarter of the truth. These censors looking down upon the *Iliad* from above a mountainous pile of lexicons, and pointing with the finger of contemptuous scorn to the map, would be very ready to rebuke Homer for representing Neptune as looking at the scene of action before Troy from above the island of Samothrace. “Now,”

says the author of that delightful work, "Eothen," standing on the very shore which

"Beheld the Iliad and the Odyssey
Rise to the swelling of the voiceful sea ;"

"Now, Samothrace, according to the map, appeared to be not only out of all seeing distance from the Troad, but to be entirely shut out from it by the intervening Imbros, which is a larger island, stretching its length right athwart the line of sight from Samothrace to Troy. Piously allowing that the dread Commoter of our Globe might have seen all mortal doings, even from the depths of his own cerulean kingdom, I still felt that if a station were to be chosen from which to see the fight, old Homer, so material in his ways of thought, so averse from all haziness and overreaching, would have *meant* to give the god, for his station, some spot within reach of men's eyes from the plains of Troy. I think that this testing of the poet's words by map and compass, may have shaken a little of my faith in the completeness of his knowledge. Well, now I had come; there to the south was Tenedos, and here at my side was Imbros, all right and according to the map; but aloft over Imbros—aloft in a far away Heaven, was Samothrace, the watchtower of Neptune!

"So Homer had appointed it, and so it was; the map was correct enough, but could not, like Homer, convey *the whole truth*.

"Nobody, whose mind had not been reduced to the most deplorably logical condition, could look upon this beautiful congruity betwixt the Iliad and the material world, and yet bear to suppose that the poet may have learned the features of the coast from mere hearsay; now then, I have believed, now I knew that Homer had *passed along here*—that this vision of Samothrace over-towering the nearer island was common to him and to me."

We have been able to repeat every word of this striking passage, from the minute when we first read it. There is an universal truth in it, as applicable to Christmas as to the Troad. But again, let us return to the sedate commentators of whom we have been speaking, the sober scholiasts on the wayward issues of human emotions and human conduct. Had they lived more than two thousand years ago, they would have been plunged into a miserable plight, by such sublime dogmatists as the Stoics. They would, we are convinced, have made, with very little hesitation, Attic Zeno the synonyme of English Dogberry, forgetting in the thick darkness of their microcosm, all the magnificent objects, which were almost within the reach of the hands of the arrogant moralist when his soul swelled, and his tongue spoke. Listen for a moment to us, ye secluded wise men, who will not take the trouble to throw open your windows, and to observe that the river of life, which flows on the ordinary days of ordinary weeks, is not the river of life which flows from Christmas Day to Twelfth Night!

“ When Zeno stood beneath the porch, contemplating

“ the eye of Greece,
Mother of arts and eloquence,”

would he look more naturally with pride or with pity towards humanity? When he thought how Athens—the matchless genius out of the family of nations—had satisfied with perfection, in an incredibly brief space of years, its cravings for all that is excellent and admirable; when from Parnes to Hymettus he surveyed the vista of

“ Statues, and Temples, and Memorial Tombs,”

by which poetry, and civilization, and glory, were to be dated for future times and men; when the sun pointed to Marathon, while Cephissus rolling to the sea, rooked Themistocles routing the barbarians at Salamis; when from the shadows of the Sacred Hill emerged the scene of awful trial—made deathless by the Tragic Three—where Minerva did not disdain in mortal presence to plead for the avenging child against the Fates; or in sorrowful array came forth the valiant, just, and wise—to whom their country owed its warlike trophies—its resplendent liberty—its noble polity—begging vainly from their fellow-citizens an hour of peace without chains, in the evening of laborious patriotism; or in dim majesty rose the image of august Socrates, vindicating truth and the immortal soul, and wringing the iron heart of jealousy, malignity, and foregone judgment—when Ilissus gently with its murmurs summoned back to his Lyceum, that stood upon its banks, the giant of knowledge, Aristotle, whose pupil was Alexander; when the Academy seemed to long for the melodious utterance once more of those divine dialogues—dim by their grandeur—concerning beauty, love, and virtue, which Plato hung in perennial freshness on the olive groves; and when gratitude, finally, settled with a ray of peculiar brightness on him, whose philosophic page first unlocked lofty meditation within the Stoic himself, on Xenophon, who had

“ The courtier's, soldier's, scholar's eye, tongue, sword;”

when all this rushed on Zeno, would not the decaying dust be shaken off from his reflections and his aspirations about a people who were thus revealed to him, and of whom he was one? Ostracism left no stain on the upright man—Aristides. Miltiades, whose fetters filial piety could not loosen, reviled by his own contemporaries, gave to all succeeding generations a name, which was their hope in bondage, and their pride in freedom.

The best—branded for a time as the worst—died as demigods. Why should not Zeno teach that virtue is its own reward?

We evoke, therefore, from their caverns the sad recluses, who are at a loss to understand why we say that mirth is the rightful monarch of a Christmas literature. Let them walk out into the sun, and judge with their own eyes from the sea-beach, whether we can from above Samothrace look down upon the Troad. The map in their solitude will not tell them *the whole truth*. A weary pilgrimage of thousands and thousands of miles, may any man pursue over the wide flat surface of a chart; but his feet cannot rise above the monotonous level of the paper, and his face will be always, as it were, prone towards the dust of the earth. It is up the living mountain's green or craggy side, that we climb skywards to

“A purer ether, a serener air.”

Only after going out of doors can we discover that the physical impossibility of the map is an airy cobweb dissipated by the summer breeze; that “the intervening Imbros” is, in truth, an intercepting prejudice, an interposed mote in vision, which may be created by the hazy delineations of a hydrographer, but exists not at all in the fair legible writing of nature; and that the eye does not pass more easily from point to point on the broad sheet of an ordnance survey, than the glance of Triton or of Briton, of sea-god or sea-king, may fly without hindrance from the summit of Samothrace down to the immortal plain of Troy, where Hector kissed Astyanax, and everybody kicked Thersites.

He who differs from us as to the kind of feeling which should prevail despotically at Christmas, must make it clear, before his opinion can bring with it any authority, that during the week between Christmas and the New Year, he has at some period of his life, not merely circumnavigated and permeated all the environs and purlieus of a great city, but has also traversed the uplands and valleys of a country side, and that wherever he has been, he has spent by far the greater portion of this time, urban or rural, in the company of rosy, romping, even rebellious children. Have ye danced with skipping-ropes, O sober Solons? Have ye galloped on hobby-horses, O lacrymose Lycurguses? Have ye flirted with dolls, O dumpish Dracos? If not;—then do not legislate intellectually or morally, and do not attempt at any time to write books for girls or boys, or, it follows logically, for men or women! He who has never been blindfolded to play at “Old Harry,” has not seen human nature behind one of the veils of Eleusis. He is of the uninitiated. He has not made to himself a playmate of the human heart in its dawn, when the foun-

tains of thought as well as of feeling, begin to bubble into light. We cannot interpret ourselves to him.

He who has never dedicated an entire holiday to play in it the part of wandering Telemachus with a child for his Mentor,—tracking with docile feet at the caprice of his guide a labyrinthine career from street to street, and from shop to shop—defraying as well as he can a wilderness of miscellaneous estimates from an inexhaustible half-sovereign—distending with a museum of purchases all the pockets of his garments, from which protrude the mouths of tin-trumpets, and the snouts of barking dogs, and the tails of elastic frogs, and the extremities of Noah's ark, as the horns of a goat have been seen to decorate the jaws of a gorged boa-constrictor;—steering so freighted deviously homewards with the consciousness that his identity has been long ago engulfed in his resemblance to a carrier's waggon—surrendering gradually the cargo to the rapine of a little nation of “young barbarians all at play,” and, ultimately, losing all recollection of everything in the whirlwind of shouts of admiration, and screams of envy,—he who has never done all this, and never felt the keenest interest while he was doing it, has failed to study so as to decipher a pregnant page in the diaries of life and character. We cannot unriddle even our axioms to him. Out of the toys comes the passion, the reflection, the action which signify the child to be so infinitely above the beasts that perish; out of the child comes the man who may sway empires. These holidays of children, so full always of animation, yet such constant repetitions one of another, are they not like the pyramids of Nile? Centuries make no change on them. But who has quite dug out the meaning which they keep embalmed?

Many observations are made on Christmas Books which fill us with astonishment. We have heard such productions discussed as if the vast conceptions of Milton, and the discursive erudition of Gibbon had been, and ought to be, at work in composing them. Rigid, symmetrical disquisitions are enunciated to denounce the emptiness of the effusion, and to demonstrate the manifest decline of the talents of the author. Dirges are chanted over the fading strength of a genius which twelve months before might have been thought worthy to woo and win Clio, or Melpomene, or Euterpe. The readers in 1847 being more bilious than in 1846, lament unanimously that the “Carol” of the one Christmas is a deplorable falling off from the “Chimes” of the other. But it is worth while to ask these mourners over a progressive degeneracy, if they know very accurately in what the merit either of “Carol” or of “Chimes” consists? We might then settle more correctly by what tribunal their demerits should be tried. For it is proper to recollect the opinion

of a great Athenian critic, Bottom, who because he starts by affirming that the play is "a very good piece of work, I assure you; and a merry," is not therefore prevented from announcing afterwards, that "there are things in this comedy Pyramus and Thisbe that will never please." Now we are inclined to think that a Carol (taking that title as a generic description of such lucubrations, whoever may have written them) is not a great creation of the brain. It is not a great historical work like Raleigh's History of the World; it is not a great epic poem like the *Æneid*; it is not a great philosophical system like Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding; it is not a great oration like Fox's speech on the Westminster Election; it is not a great statistical repertory like Maculloch's Commercial Dictionary; it is not even a great fiction like Don Quixote. None of these is a Carol; nor does anybody expect a Carol to embrace any such matters. Mr. Dickens, or Mr. Thackeray, amuses himself, and should delight everybody else, by publishing a Christmas story. Against that story, when it appears, we do not immediately erect the same formidable battery, and level the same heavy ordnance of criticism as we might do if we were minded either to salute or to demolish Alison's History of Modern Europe. We shall take, to please or to displease somebody, as an illustration of our notions—the "Battle of Life," by Dickens. It is not the *chef-d'œuvre* of Dickens; it is nearly the worst book he ever wrote. It is not on that account necessarily a bad Christmas Book;—it was not in reality a bad Christmas Book. But if we sat down to review it in the same mood in which the French army, fifteen years ago, sat down to take Antwerp, with all the warlike munition and preparation necessary for the reduction of a first-rate fortress, it is very obvious that the "Battle of Life" would cease altogether to be a book of any sort, good, bad, or indifferent, under the opening broadside of an artillery which might annihilate Napier's Peninsular War, or Wordsworth's Excursion. This is not the temper in which sensible people will sit down before a Christmas Carol, even if it is the "Battle of Life." For it is not a frowning hostile fortress, but a smiling friendly chateau, of moderate dimensions, and small pretensions, which, repelling nobody, invites with its doors wide ajar, everybody who has leisure or desire to enter and partake of the fare which, such as it is, has been provided. The fare, we say, is to be taken, such as it is; because, in sooth, it is not the food which is given nearly so much as the spirit in which the entertainment is offered, which is the fascination, almost the substance of such hospitality. Let us have then the Carol, even such as it is, with that delightful disposition of general good humour and good-will which pervades and colours it; and although the story is silly, and vapid, and

feeble, makes it a dish fit for Christmas. Give us the very "Battle of Life,"

"With all its imperfections on its head;"

and never mind, in the meantime, the abilities of Mr. Dickens.

Conspicuously upon the shelves of our Christmas library we should begin by placing some famous tales to which we are united by an infinite variety of associations. The series, we think, commences with a lively narrative about "Jack and the Bean-stalk," and concludes with the moving incidents in the history of "Miranda and the Royal Ram." But between these two terminal points what an endless catalogue there is of books which we are firmly convinced "the world will not willingly let die." It is true, that not many years ago, a copy of "Puss in Boots" was unattainable, and that industry and ingenuity were needed to excavate even "Blue Beard" from the gathering dusts of oblivion. A whisper began to steal through society that the dynasty of "Beauty and the Beast" was disrowned for ever. Nor was it possible to controvert the rumour which insinuated that "Cinderella" had enticed "Jack-the-giant-killer" to seek a home under German or Italian skies;—for they were not to be seen anywhere on British ground. But away from this island—

"This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this England"—

they could not long remain. The warmest climate on the continent of Europe is chilly in comparison with the comfortable blaze of an English parlour or nursery fire-side. Who can feel genially or speak fluently of fairies or goblins, as he sits beside a black brightly-burnished stove, like the jack-boot of a colossal Cornet in the Life-Guards? The crackling coal, released from subterraneous thralldom, brings with it into upper air swarms of gnomes and sprites, on whose fiery and extravagant visages the child rivets its eyes, as its ears are drinking in the thrilling tones of an aunt or cousin, telling it how—

"the midnight chimes had sounded from the clock of the great tower. The moon shone fitfully with a gleam now and then between heavy masses of black clouds that swept past, as if ordered suddenly into the battle of the elements. The strong wind, rushing steadily across the sky, seemed to strike the earth with gusts of capricious violence, as the sea-bird, skinning the sea, flaps wantonly at uncertain intervals the surface of the waves. But as often as the blast came and buffeted the old turretted mansion, then windows rattled and doors banged, while dreary, sighing, sobbing, wailing noises boomed along the corridors and crept up the stair-cases. The doors, particularly of the dim oak-panelled library, were restless and creaking, so that, in spite of the desperate fascination of his study, the solitary reader looked

more than once askance cautiously from his book. The lamp flickered in its socket. Of a once roaring great fire there lived only a few embers, lapsing with headlong plunges from redness into darkness, like a December afternoon. All at once the hurricane, gathering its might, swooped down with a yell upon the ancient building, shaking it from battlement to base. In the lull that instantly followed, the melancholy bells of the tower tolled—*ONE*; the lamp flashed its final flash, and went out; the book fell with a crash from the table to the floor; the tempest again bellowed out its fury; and —."

Well, back from their banishment, or from the temporary estrangement of men's ingratitude, the exiles have returned and been set free. The "*Marquis of Carabas*," and "*Little Red Riding-Hood*," with all their kindred, came like conquerors with the pomp of an ovation. How gorgeously apparelled! how gracefully adorned! During so brief an interval as we can reckon, the little books which we used to buy for a halfpenny each, and in which the river of the letterpress was blocked up occasionally by black boulder-stones of illustration, quite satisfactory to our juvenile notions of the skill of engravers, have been displaced and replaced by volumes of exquisite beauty and fearful price, illuminated by magnificent artists, and published by magnificent booksellers. Suddenly, it would seem, the suggestive virtues of all these inimitable stories opened themselves up, like lovely and fragrant flowers, to stimulate and to reward the industry of the pencil. Many ages rolled between Homer and Flaxman. Only in our own days—only the other day, have the "*White Cat*" and "*Fortunio*" enhanced their original enchantment by the delicate and vigorous interpretation of the outlines of J. W. And who is J. W.? Whose are the Egyptian hieroglyphics? We know very well who J. W. is. We nodded assent to Landseer when he said that in the drawing of animals he had nothing to teach J. W. But why should we enrich a dull world with a secret, which, as it appears to us, every whisker of a cat, and every nostril of a horse, reveals? It is a rare gift indeed to represent so easily and so faultlessly the graces and the powers of animals. The faculty of doing so testifies to more than a true eye and a cunning hand; it indicates a happy spirit and a good heart. It is safe to predicate favourably of anybody

" Who loveth well
Both man, and bird, and beast."

We do not hesitate to regard the designs of J. W. as perfect specimens of animal portraiture—every line, curve, and point instinct with life or full of repose—the mirrors of nature. Not so felicitous, however, in the opinions of many, has been the execution of the human figure by the same artist. We shall not stop to scruti-

nize the causes of such an inequality. The difference of mental perception, as well as of manual dexterity; nay, the eccentricities and discrepancies of genius—are numberless. In the present case, several valid reasons, if we were only at liberty to divulge the mystery of the initial letters, might be stated to explain an apparent defect in the practical development of a high endowment. But a similar incongruity, of a very old date, and in a most remarkable instance, has attracted general observation. Madame de Staël has written in *Corinne*, “*Les sculpteurs Egyptiens saïssaient avec bien plus de génie la figure des animaux que celle des hommes.*” And as a corollary to the sagacious justice of this criticism, Sir Gardner Wilkinson in his work on *Modern Egypt and Thebes* adds, that—

“In observing the accuracy with which the general forms and characters of their animals are drawn, one cannot but feel surprised that the Egyptians should have so imperfect a knowledge of the art of representing the trees and flowers of their country, which, with the exception of the lotus, palm, and dôm, can scarcely ever be identified; unless the fruit, as in the pomegranate and sycamore, are present to assist us.”

It is an odd resemblance to trace between the pencil of the modern amateur, and the chisel of the almost primeval sculptor, who may have gazed at bird and beast with the same acute and unerring eye as artists, but as reasonable and social beings, scarcely with the same feelings, and certainly not for the same purposes. And yet there is—is there not?—a common sympathy which, across the desert of thousands of years, links the haughty hierophant of Isis with the fair young girl, whose name—familiar to our ears as a household word—was now perilously trembling on the verge of our treacherous lips. We long to see, taken from a living study, plashing in the stream or the mud of the Fertilizing River, the portrait of a huge crocodile, by J. W. At all events it is pleasant to feel that animals have good friends among mankind, who are willing and able to gratify the flutterings of a vanity, from which the bosoms of the fowls of the air or the quadrupeds of the plain are not exempt. The ostentatious insolence of a peacock, “with its tail on,” does not interest us half so much as the haughty pettishness—the arching of the neck—the gesture of the head—the gleaming in the eye, with which a gaily-caparisoned palfrey returns the caresses of the white hand of its mistress. And that rough, shaggy comrade, whose ancestors are invisible in the mists of Newfoundland—who is to day playfully frightening the ducks in the same pool from which yesterday he seriously rescued a drowning child—shall there be no vivid memorial made of him? Or that super-

canine creature, which has a title to assert of itself, although walking on four feet,

“Homo sum—nihil humani a me alienum puto,”

that sheep-dog, which gathers its scattered hosts together from the broad shoulders of the hills, telling them off by head-mark, and one by one, into the fold, as Xerxes is fabled to have been able to name each atom of the myriads, whose ephemeral existence he wept—and destroyed; shall that dog not transmit its likeness to posterity? Certainly it shall, while Landseer and J. W. live to rejoice brutes and men.

There are folks, we believe, who supposed that the legends and stories—at the head of which has been marching, we cannot tell how long, the inimitable Tom Thumb—would perish out of the knowledge and recollection of the present generations of children. The succession of the seasons may be altered. Harvests may ripen in February. Snow may be deep and sure in July. Nature may change, or check its vegetation, forbidding germs to sprout, or buds to burst into blossom, or flowers to be succeeded by fruits. Upon the occurrence of such vicissitudes, it is not unlikely that those bright and gladsome issues of fancy, which we shall praise whenever we can, may disappear and be extinguished. But while the existing economy of the globe endures, they will baffle oppression, and rise above neglect. For what are they? We are soberly aware that their narratives do not recount anything which has taken place. Why then were they imagined, or embodied in words? For whose pleasure, or at whose instigation, did adult men and women, “of sapient eye serene,” clothe all these whimsical and extravagant ideas with language? There is only one answer. It was to meet the incessant calls on their imaginations made by infancy, boyhood, and girlhood. A boy, ten years old, is not crammed daily with continuous plates of turtle soup till he chokes, and saturated with libations of port wine till he falls below the table. A girl of equally tender age is not launched every night into the frothy whirlpool of the ball-room, that she may revisit, haggard and exhausted, her couch, just at the moment Aurora, rosy-fingered and spangled with fresh dew, is shaking slumber from her feet. These gastronomical and terpsichorean labours come with maturity and physical strength. Is it not idle to surfeit the mind of the child with astronomy, philology, botany, chronology, and an endless retinue of abstruse, austere, and grisly sciences, at an age when the triangles, circles, and parallelograms of Euclid must be routed and cut to pieces by the caliphs, and fishermen, and Aladdins of the Arabian Nights, as irretrievably as were the Sikhs at Aliwal by Sir

Harry Smith. Let it be cabined and confined within the most commonplace gratings of hard dry fact, it will be found that, in spite of all that can be done to hinder or otherwise employ it, the soul of youth is off on the wings of the rushing winds to visit the unwithering flowers of fancy, with which its own vernal growth claims communion; and that it has been busy as a bee, not with arithmetical calculations, but with

“Hyblean murmurs of poetic thought.”

The system of education which precociously feeds the child with the diet of manhood, is as erroneous and unseasonable as the mawkish sentimentality and melodramatic fustian which now and then parades itself as an “elegant extract” of Christmas literature.

The “*Annals*” were a short-lived race of arrogant invaders;

“Their cohorts were gleaming with purple and gold.”

We must have spoken very indistinctly if our censure of these tawdry gewgaws and fierce vanities of literature is not anticipated. Surveyed under the most charitable and glowing atmosphere in which criticism can breathe, they are to be condemned, *en masse*, as ineffably silly and incurably stupid. No bands of agreeable memories glide out of such dens of dulness. No ghost of a lively chapter, or witty sentence, or melodious stanza, rises up to arrest the current of perdition which has swept away so much gold-beater's leaf and satin paper. The “*League*” or the “*Armada*,” by Macaulay, did sometimes flash across the monotonous obscurity; but on meeting unexpectedly with such gems, we are but the more sharply reminded of the place in which the fable tells us that the cock picked up a jewel. Was there not any exception? Candidly we think there was none, except the “*Book of Beauty*.” Delightful to look on were the faces of the daughters of the isles; because it became a part of our patriotism to know proudly that these charms were glowing in living lustre among ourselves. But if the faces are not portraits, there is an end of our patriotism and our patronage. The Queens and the wives of the Kings of England are not fictions. They once moved, “earth-treading stars” of flesh and blood, within the circling rampart of the four seas. The luckless mates of Harry were not shadows; neither the stately consort of Edward, nor the melting bride of Richard, was a phantom. Let us by all means make acquaintance with their features, if Holbein, or Vandyke, or any other faithful chronicler with the brush, can give us the actual lights and shadows of their beauty and dignity. But, for a single sufficient reason, we hope never again to see a volume published at Christmas, or

at any period of any year, crowded with imaginary portraits of British Queens. The single reason is, that in every instance, the representative countenance is as far as possibly remote from what its real constituent was or could have been. There is not a lucky hit in the whole gallery. And is British beauty extinct? Of course it is not, since the pseudo-royal galaxy itself is a transcript of living faces. Not even the name of loveliness should be counterfeit; it had better be anonymous, as in the tedious catalogues of our Exhibition Rooms. Pope remarks epigrammatically,

“ Since Queensberry to strip there’s no compelling,
’Tis from her handmaid we must take a Helen.”

To call the likeness of the handmaid by the name of Helen is bad enough; but if the painter, having transferred the handmaid to the canvass, should venture to affix the name of the mistress to his picture, and to send it forth as the portrait of “Queensberry,” would he not have been deservedly torn asunder by the populace, like Cinna the bad poet? It had occurred to us that the long line of Highland porters who in the great corridor of Holyrood Palace carry, as their lightest burden, the crown of Scotland down from Fergus I. to the last of the Stuarts, might effectually check the repetition of a hypothetical or theoretical royal family. The ladies of the “Book of Beauty, 1848,” are excellent counterparts of their Caledonian cousins.

To quarrel, at the present instant, with two beautiful women, is a harder task than we are inclined to encounter. There is, however, a provocation for us to reproach, without anger, those “weird sisters,” who, sharing an inheritance of brilliant talents and pathetic eloquence, from him whose name is inseparably interwoven with the glories of the constitution, and the language of England, do now lavish on the gaudy *parterres* of fleeting “annuals,” a pains-taking culture, which might foster perennial thoughts and deathless strains. Generous impulses, and wise feelings, are theirs; noble words in stirring tones flow at their bidding; they can hurl the glancing javelin of keenest satire; they can smite with stout blows of the sword of indignant justice; they can, if they will, do battle greatly for many great causes. Will they not? “Aunt Carry,” besides, can write charming little Christmas tales. Has she done so this year?

Once for all, then, the literature of Christmas should be a manly, frank, merry, even frolicsome literature. Melancholy and tragedy have nothing to do with it. Pompous declamations of morality will be drowned by penny trumpets in the streets. The true, rational, natural Christmas spirit—to be dominant for

a week every year, in which we should write and read, tell stories
• and listen to them, is just the spirit of

“delight in little things,
The buoyant child surviving in the man;”

For what we have now written has not been written in solitude. The ebb and the flow of the tide of a vast population has been unceasingly before our eyes and in our ears. Beneath us masses of quiet, orderly, happy people, have been from sunrise to sunset, thronging the thoroughfares of a great city, indefatigable in its manufacturing industry—dauntless in its commercial enterprise—the heart of a rich agricultural province—the seat of two ancient universities—the abode of a sagacious, cultivated, generous race. Swelling upwards to our heart every moment, the voices of their joyance

“Have all burst forth in choral minstrelsy,
As if some sudden gale had swept at once
A hundred airy harps.”

And as we looked down from the window on the crowd below, we observed that the father or mother, with a smile, was always led by the child. So Criticism wrote a Carol on New Year's Day.

ART. VI.—*Horae Biblicae Quotidianae. Daily Scripture Readings.* By the late THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D., LL.D. Edited by the Rev. WILLIAM HANNA, LL.D. Vols. I. II. Edinburgh, 1847-48.

WHEN, at the close of some long summer's day, we come suddenly, *and, as we think, before his time*, upon the broad sun, going down in his tranquillity into the unclouded west, we cannot keep our eyes from the great spectacle,—and when he is gone the shadow of him haunts our sight : we see, everywhere,—upon the spotless heaven, upon the distant mountains, upon the fields, and upon the road at our feet,—that dim, strange, changeful image,—and if our eyes shut, to recover themselves, we still find in them, like a dying flame, or like a gleam in a dark place, the unmistakeable phantom of the mighty orb that has set,—and were we to sit down, as we have often done, and try to record by pencil or by pen, our impression of that holy time, still would it be there. We must have patience with our eye, it will not let the impression go,—that spot on which the radiant disk was impressed, is insensible to all other outward things, for a time : its best relief is, to let it wander vaguely over earth and sky, and repose itself on the mild shadowy distance.

So it is when a great, and good, and beloved man departs, sets—it may be suddenly—and to us who know not the times and the seasons, *too soon*. We gaze eagerly at his last hours, and when he is gone, never to rise again on our sight, we see his image wherever we go, and in whatsoever we are engaged, and if we try to get quit of, or to record by words our wonder, and our sorrow, and our affection, we cannot see to do it, for the “idea of his life” is for ever coming into our “study of imagination”—into all our thoughts, and we can do little else than let our mind, in a wise passiveness, hush itself to rest.

The sun returns—he knows his rising—

“To-morrow he repairs his drooping head,
And tricks his beams, and with new spangled ore
Flames in the forehead of the morning sky ;”

but man lieth down, and riseth not again till the heavens are no more. Never again will he whose “*Meditations*” are now before us, lift up the light of his countenance upon us, he will be no more seen among men.

We need not say we look upon him, as a great man, as a good man, as a beloved man,—*quis desiderio sit pudor tam cari capitis?* We cannot now go very curiously to work, to scrutinize the com-

position of his character,—we cannot take that large, free, genial nature to pieces, and weigh this, and measure that, and sum up and pronounce—we are too near as yet to him, and to his loss, he is too dear to us to be so handled. “His death,” to use the pathetic words of Hartley Coleridge, “is a recent sorrow; his image still lives in eyes that weep for him.” The prevailing feeling is, HE IS GONE—“ABIIT AD PLURES,—*he has gone over to the majority,—he has joined the famous nations of the dead.*”

It is no small loss to the world, when one of its master spirits—one of its great lights—a king among the nations—leaves it. A sun is extinguished—a great attractive, regulating power is withdrawn. For though it be a common, it is also a natural thought, to compare a great man to the sun; it is in many respects very significant. Like the sun, he rules his day, and he is “for a sign and for seasons, and for days and for years,”—he enlightens, quickens, attracts, and leads after him his host—his generation.

To pursue our image. When the sun sets to us, he rises elsewhere—he goes on rejoicing, like a strong man, running his race. So does a great man: when he leaves us and our concerns—he rises elsewhere; and we may reasonably suppose that one who has in this world played a great part in its greatest histories—who has through a long life been eminent in his generation for promoting the good of men and the glory of God—will be looked upon with keen interest, when he joins the company of the immortals. They must have heard of his fame—they may in their way have seen and helped him already.

Every one must have trembled when reading that passage in Isaiah, in which Hell is described as moved to meet Lucifer at his coming: there is not in human language anything more sublime in conception, more exquisite in expression; it has on it the light of the terrible crystal. But may we not reverse the scene? May we not imagine, on a great and good man—a true son of the morning—entering on his rest, that Heaven would move itself to meet him at his coming? That it would stir up its dead—even all the chief ones of the earth, and that the kings of the nations would arise each one from his throne to welcome their royal brother? that those who saw him would “narrowly consider him,” and say, “is this the man who moved nations—enlightened and bettered his fellows—who brought forth to his great Taskmaster an hundredfold?”

We cannot help following him whose loss we now mourn into that region, and figuring to ourselves his large, childlike spirit, when that unspeakable scene bursts upon his view, when, as by some inward, instant sense, he is conscious of God—of the immediate presence of the Allseeing Unseen—when he beholds

"His honourable, true, and only Son," face to face, enshrined in, "that glorious form, that light unsufferable, and that far beaming blaze of majesty," that brightness of His glory, that express image of His person—when he is admitted into the goodly fellowship of the apostles—the glorious company of the prophets—the noble army of martyrs—the general assembly of just men—and beholds with his loving eyes the myriads of "little ones,"* outnumbering their elders as the dust of stars with which the heavens are filled exceeds in multitude the other heavenly bodies—for of such is the kingdom.

What a change! a second birth,—a new life, in the twinkling of an eye: this moment, weak, fearful, in the amazement of death,—the next, strong, joyful,—at rest,—all things new! To adopt his own words:—all his life, up to the last, "knocking at a door not yet opened, with an earnest indefinite longing,

* We cannot resist quoting a passage of great beauty from Dr. Chalmers' Lectures on Romans iv. 9, 15:—

"This affords, we think, something more than a dubious glimpse into the question that is often put by a distracted mother when her babe is taken away from her—when all the converse it had ever had with the world amounted to the gaze upon it of a few months, or a few opening smiles which marked the dawn of felt enjoyment; and ere it had reached perhaps the lisp of infancy, it, all unconscious of death, had to wrestle through a period of sickness with his power, and at length to be overcome by him. Oh, it little knew what an interest it had created in that home where it was so passing a visitant—nor, when carried to its early grave, what a tide of emotion it would raise among the few acquaintances it left behind! On it, too, baptism was impressed as a seal, and as a sign, it was never falsified. There was no positive unbelief in its little bosom—no resistance yet put forth to the truth—no love at all for the darkness rather than the light—nor had it yet fallen into that great condemnation which will attach to all who perish because of unbelief—that their deeds are evil. . . . And when we couple with this the known disposition of our great Forerunner—the love that He manifested to children on earth—how He suffered them to approach His person—and, lavishing endearment and kindness upon them in the streets of Jerusalem, told His disciples that the presence and company of such as these in heaven formed one ingredient of the joy that was set before Him—tell us if Christianity do not throw a pleasing radiance round an infant's tomb? And should any parent who hears us feel softened by the touching remembrance of a light that twinkled a few short months under his roof, and at the end of its little period expired, we cannot think that we venture too far, when we say, that he has only to persevere in the faith and in the following of the gospel, and that very light will again shine upon him in heaven. The blossom which withered here upon its stalk has been transplanted there to a place of endurance; and it will then gladden that eye which now weeps out the agony of an affection that has been sorely wounded; and in the name of Him, who, if on earth, would have wept along with them, do we bid all believers present to sorrow not even as others which have no hope, but to take comfort in the thought of that country where there is no sorrow and no separation.

O, when a mother meets on high
 Tho babe she lost in infancy,
 Hath she not then, for pains and fears—
 The day of wo, the watchful night—
 For all her sorrow, all her tears,
 An over-payment of delight!"

Lectures on the Romans, vol. i. pp. 234-5.

—his very soul breaking for the longing,—drinking of water, and thirsting again”—and then—suddenly and at once—a door opened into heaven, and the Master heard saying, “Come in, and come up hither!”—drinking of the river of life, clear as crystal, of which if a man drink he will never thirst,—being filled with all the fulness of God!

DR. CHALMERS WAS A RULER AMONG MEN: this we know historically; this every man who came within his range felt at once. He was like Agamemnon, a native *αγαξ ἀνδρῶν*, and with all his homeliness of feature and deportment, and his perfect simplicity of expression, there was about him “that divinity that doth hedge a king.” You felt a power, in him, and going from him, drawing you to him in spite of yourself. He was in this respect a *solar* man, he drew after him his own firmament of planets. They, like all free agents, had their centrifugal forces acting ever towards an independent, solitary course, but the centripetal also was there, and they moved round, and with, their sun,—gracefully or not, willingly or not, as the case might be, but there was no breaking loose: they again, in their own spheres of power, might and would, have their attendant moons, but all were bound to the great massive luminary in the midst of them.

There is to us a continual mystery in the power any one man has over another. We find it acting everywhere, with the simplicity, the ceaselessness, the energy of gravitation, and this influence may be said to obey similar if not the same conditions; it is proportioned to *bulk*—for we hold to the notion of *larger* and *lesser* souls and hearts, as well as good and not so good in *quality*; and its intensity increases by nearness.

But when we meet a *solar* man, a being of large nature—soul, body, and spirit—when we find him from his earliest years moving among his fellows like a king, moving them whether they will or no—this feeling of mystery is deepened; and though we do not, like some men (who should know better,) worship the creature and convert a hero into a god, we do feel more than in other cases the truth, that it is the inspiration of the Almighty which has given to that man understanding, and that all power, all energy, all light, come to him, from the First and the Last—the Living One. God comes to be regarded by us, in this instance, as he ought always to be, “the final centre of repose”—the source of all being, of all life—the *Terminus ad quem* and the *Terminus a quo*. And assuredly, as in the firmament that simple law of gravitation reigns supreme—making it indeed a kosmos—majestic, orderly, comely in its going—ruling, and binding not less the fiery and lawless comets, than the gentle, punctual moons—so certainly, and to us moral creatures to a degree transcendently more impor-

tant, does the whole intelligent universe move round and move towards the Father of Lights.

It would be well if the world would, among the many other uses they make of its great men, make more of this,—that they are manifesters of God—revealers of His will—vessels of His omnipotence—and are among the very chiefest of His ways and works.

As we have before said, there is a great mystery in this power of one man over his fellows, especially when we meet with it in a great man. You see its operations constantly in history, and through it the Great Ruler has worked out many of His greatest and strangest acts. But however we may understand the accessory conditions by which one man rules other men, and controls, and fashions them to his purposes, and transforms them into his likeness—multiplying as it were himself—there remains at the bottom of it all a mystery—a reaction between body and soul that we cannot explain. Generally, however, we find accompanying its manifestation—a capacious understanding—a strong will—an emotional nature, quick, powerful, urgent, undeniable, and in perpetual communication with the energetic will and the large intellect—and a strong, hearty, capable body; a countenance and person expressive of this combination—the mind finding its way at once and in full force to the face, to the gesture, to every act of the body. He must have what is called a “presence;” not that he must be great in size, beautiful or strong; but he must be expressive, and impressive—his outward man must communicate to the beholder at once and without fail, something of indwelling power, and he must be and act as *one*. You may in your mind analyze him into his several parts; but practically he acts in everything with his whole soul and his whole self; whatsoever his hand finds to do, he does it with his might. Luther, Moses, David, Mahomet, Cromwell—all verified these conditions.

And so did Dr. Chalmers. There was something about his whole air and manner, that disposed you at the very first to make way where he went—he held you before you were aware. That this depended fully as much upon the activity and the quantity—if we may so express ourselves—of his affections, and upon that unknown combined action of mind and body which we call temperament, and upon a straightforward, energetic will—as upon what is called the pure intellect, will be generally allowed; but with all this, he could not have been and done what he was and did, had he not had an understanding, in vigour and in capacity, fully worthy of its great and ardent companions. It was large, and free, and mobile, and intense, rather than penetrative, judicial, clear, or fine,—so that in one sense he was more a man to make others *act* than *think*; but his own

actings had always their origin in some fixed, central, urgent *proposition*, as he would call it, and he always began his onset with stating plainly what he held to be a great seminal truth ; from this he passed at once, not into exposition, but into illustration and enforcement—into, if we may make a word, overwhelming insistence. Something was to be done, rather than explained.

There was no separating his thoughts and expressions from his person, and looks, and voice. How perfectly we can at this moment recall him as he went in and out before us ! Thundering, flaming, lightening in the pulpit ; teaching, indoctrinating, drawing after him his students in his lecture-room ; sitting among other public men, the most unconscious, the most king-like of them all, with that leonine countenance, that beaming, liberal smile ; or on the way out to his home, in his old-fashioned great-coat, with his throat muffled up, his big walking-stick moved outwards in an arc, its point fixed, its head circumferential, a sort of companion, and playmate, with which, doubtless, he demolished legions of imaginary foes, errors, and stupidities in men and things, in Church and State. His great look, large chest, large head, his amplitude everywhere ; his broad, simple, childlike, inturned feet ; his short, hurried, impatient step ; his erect, royal air ; his look of general goodwill ; his kindling up into a warm but still vague benignity when one he did not recognise spoke to him ; the addition, for it was not a change, of keen speciality to his hearty recognition ; the twinkle of his eyes ; the immediately saying something very personal to set all to rights, and then the sending you off with some thought, some feeling, some remembrance, making your heart burn within you ; his voice indescribable : his eye—that most peculiar feature—not vacant, but *asleep*—innocent, mild, large ; and his soul, its great inhabitant, not always at his window ; and then, when he did awake, how close to you was that burning vehement soul ! how it infected you, and went through you ! how mild, and affectionate, and genial its expression at his own fireside. But we may not enter there—a stranger may not intermeddle with the joys that are gone and remembered, and the sorrows that remain, and that refuse to be comforted. He was a man unlike many public and even great men, the nearer you got to him, the better, the goodlier, did he appear.

Of his portraits worth mentioning, there are Watson Gordon's—Duncan's—the Calotypes of Mr. Hill—Kenneth M'Leay's miniatures—the Daguerreotype, and Steell's bust. These are all good, and all give bits of him, some nearly the whole, but not one that *τι θερμον*, that *fiery particle*—that inspired

look—that “diviner mind”—the *poco più*—the “little more.” Watson Gordon’s is too much of the mere clergyman—is a pleasant likeness, and has the shape of his mouth, and the setting of his feet very good. Duncan’s is a work of genius—and is the giant looking up, awakening, but not awakened—it is a very fine picture. Mr. Hill’s Calotypes we like better than all the rest; because what in them is true, is absolutely so, and they have some delicate renderings which are all but beyond the power of any mortal artist; for though art is mighty, nature is mightier—“it is the art of God.” The one of the Doctor sitting with his grandson “Tommy,” is to us the best—we have the true grandeur of his form—his bulk—like one of the elder gods. Kenneth McLeay’s is admirable—spirited—and has that look of shrewdness and vivacity which he had when he was observing and speaking keenly—it is, moreover, a fine, broad, manly bit of art. McLeay is the Raeburn of miniature painters—he does a great deal with little. The Daguerreotype is, in its own way, excellent, it gives the externality of the man to perfection, but it is Dr. Chalmers at a stand still—his mind and feelings “pulled up” for the second that it was taken. Steell’s is a noble bust—has a stern heroic expression and beauty about it, and from wanting colour and shadow and the eyes, it relies upon a certain simplicity and dignity;—in this it completely succeeds—the mouth is handled with extraordinary subtlety and sweetness, and the hair hangs over that ample brow like a glorious cloud. We think this head of Dr. Chalmers the artist’s greatest bust.

In reference to the assertion we have made as to bulk entering into the formation of a powerful mind, Dr. Chalmers used to say, when a man of activity and public mark was mentioned, “is he weighty? has he weight?” “he has promptitude—has he power?” “he has power—has he intelligence? has he a discerning spirit?”

These are great practical, universal truths. How few if any of our greatest men have ever had all these three faculties large—fine, sound, and in “perfect diapason.” Your men of promptitude, without power or judgment, are common, and are useful. But they are apt to run wild, to get needlessly brisk, unpleasantly incessant. A weasel is good or bad as the case may be,—good against vermin—bad to meddle with;—but an inspired weasel, a weasel on a mission, is terrible indeed,—mischievous beyond calculation, making up for want of momentum by inveteracy, killing like lightning by its speed; “fierce as wild bulls, *untameable as flies*.” Of such men we have now-a-days too many. Men are too much in the way of supposing that *doing*, is *being*; that theology and excogitation, and fierce dogmatic assertion of what they consider truth, is godliness; that obedi-

ence is merely an occasional great act, and not a series of acts, issuing from a state, like the spring of water from its well.

"Action is transitory—a step—a blow,
The motion of a muscle—this way or that;
'Tis done—and in the after vacancy,
We wonder at ourselves like men betrayed."
"Suffering" (*obedience, or being as opposed to doing,*)—
"Suffering is permanent,———
And has the nature of infinity."

DR. CHALMERS WAS A MAN OF GENIUS—he had his own way of thinking, and saying, and doing, and looking everything. Men have vexed themselves in vain to define what genius is; like every ultimate term we may describe it by giving its effects, we can hardly succeed in reaching its essence. Fortunately, though we know not what are its elements, we know it when we meet it; and in him, in every movement of his mind, in every gesture, we had its unmistakable tokens. Two of the ordinary accompaniments of genius—Enthusiasm and Simplicity—he had in rare measure.

He was an *enthusiast* in its true and good sense; "he was entheat," as the old poets called it. It was this ardour, this superabounding life, this immediateness of thought and action, idea and emotion, setting the whole man agoing at once—that gave a power and a charm to everything he did. To adopt the old division of the Hebrew Doctors, as given by Nathaniel Culverwel, in his "Light of Nature." In man we have—1st, *πνευμα ζωοποιούν*, the *sensitive soul*, that which lies nearest the body—the very blossom and flower of life; 2^d, *τον νοον*, *animam rationis*, sparkling and glittering with intellects, crowned with light; and 3^d, *τον θυμον*, *impetum animi*, *motum mentis*, the vigour and energy of the soul—its temper—the mover of the other two—the first being, as they said, resident in *hepate*—the second in *cerebro*,—the third in *corde*, where it presides over the issues of life, commands the circulation, and animates and sets the blood amoving. The first and second are informative, explicative, they "take in and do"—the other "gives out." Now, in Dr. Chalmers, the great ingredient was the *ὁ θυμος* as indicating *vis animæ et viæ*,—and in close fellowship with it, and ready for its service, was a large, capacious *ὁ νοος*, and an energetic sensuous, rapid, *το πνευμα*. Hence his energy, his contagious enthusiasm—this it was which gave the peculiar character to his religion, to his politics, to his *personnel*—everything he did was done heartily—if he desired heavenly blessings he "panted" for them—"his soul broke for the longing." To give again the

words of the spiritual and subtle Culverwel, "religion (and indeed everything else) was no matter of indifference to him. It was *θερμον τι παρρημα*, a certain fiery thing, as Aristotle calls love—it required and it got, the very flower and vigour of the spirit—the strength and sinews of the soul—the prime and top of the affections—this is that grace, that panting grace—we know the name of it and that's all—'tis called zeal—a flaming edge of the affection—the ruddy complexion of the soul." Closely connected with this temperament, and with a certain keen sensation of truth, rather than a perception of it, if we may so express ourselves, an intense consciousness of objective truth was his simple animating faith. He had faith in God—faith in human nature—faith, if we may say so, in his own instincts—in his ideas of men and things—IN HIMSELF; and the result was, that unhesitating bearing up and steering right onward—"never bating one jot of heart or hope" so characteristic of him. He had "the substance of things hoped for." He had "the evidence of things not seen."

By his *simplicity* we do not mean the simplicity of the head—of that he had none—he was eminently shrewd and knowing—more so than many thought—but we refer to that quality of the heart and of the life, expressed by the words, "in simplicity a child." In his own words, from his Daily Readings,—

"When a child is filled with any strong emotion by a surprising event or intelligence, it runs to discharge it on others, impatient of their sympathy; and it marks, I fancy, the simplicity and greater naturalness of this period, (Jacob's,) that the grown up men and women ran to meet each other, giving way to their first impulses—even as children do."

There was in all his ways a certain beautiful unconsciousness of self—an outgoing of the whole man that we see in children, who are by learned men said to be long in attaining to the EGO—blessed in many respects in their ignorance! This same EGO, as it now exists, being, we believe, part of "the fruit of that forbidden tree;" that mere *knowledge* of good as well as of evil, which our great mother bought for us at such a price. In this meaning of the word, Dr. Chalmers, considering the size of his understanding—his personal eminence—his dealings with the world—his large sympathies—his scientific knowledge of mind and matter—his relish for the practical details, and for the spirit of public business—was quite singular for his simplicity; and taking this view of it, there was much that was plain and natural in his manner of thinking and acting, which otherwise was obscure—and liable to be misunderstood. We cannot better explain what we mean than by giving a passage from

Fénélon, which D'Alembert, in his *Eloge* upon him, as one of the Members of the French Academy, quotes as specifically characteristic of that "sweet-souled" prelate. We give the passage entire, as it seems to us to contain a very beautiful, and by no means commonplace, truth:—

"Fénélon," says D'Alembert, "a caractérisé lui-même en peu de mots cette simplicité qui se rendoit si cher à tous les cœurs—*La simplicité est la droiture d'une ame qui s'interdit tout retour sur elle et sur ses actions—cette vertu est différente de la sincérité, et la surpasse. On voit beaucoup de gens qui sont sincères sans être simples—Ils ne veulent passer que pour ce qu'ils sont, mais ils craignent sans cesse de passer pour ce qu'ils ne sont pas. L'homme simple n'affecte ni la vertu, ni la vérité même; il n'est jamais occupé de lui, il semble d'avoir perdu ce moi dont on est si jaloux.*"

What delicacy of expression! how true, how clear, how clarifying! How little we see now-a-days, among grown-up men, of this straightness of the soul—of this losing or never finding "*ce moi!*" There is more than is generally thought in all this. Man in a state of perfection, would no sooner think of asking himself—am I right? am I appearing to be what inwardly I am? than the eye asks itself—do I see? or a child asks itself—do I love my mother? We have lost this instinctive sense—we have set one portion of ourselves aside to watch the rest, we must keep up appearances, and our consistency—we must respect ourselves, and be respected, if possible; we must, at all events, be respectable. As Carlyle quaintly and strongly says of Balaam, when he went out to curse, and yet not to curse Israel, "nor to do anything so much as a nothing that would look like a something, and bring wages in"—"not that the man was dishonest, *much less honest*, only he had been, was, and ever must be, *respectable*."

Dr. Chalmers would have made a sorry Balaam; he was made of different stuff, and for other purposes. Your "respectable" men are ever doing their best to keep their status, to maintain their position. He never troubled himself about his status—indeed, we would say *status* was not the word for him. He had a *sedes* on which he rested, and from which he spoke; he had an *imperium*, athwart which he roamed as he listed: but a *status* was as little in his way as in that of a Mauritanian lion. Your merely "sincere" men, are always thinking of what they said yesterday, and what they may say to-morrow, at the very moment when they should be putting their whole self into to-day. Full of his idea, possessed by it, moved altogether by its power,—believing, he spoke, and without stint or fear, often *apparently* contradicting his former self—careless about every thing, but speaking fully his mind. One other reason for his apparent

inconsistencies was, if one may so express it, the largeness of his nature. He had room in that capacious head, and power in that large hospitable heart, for relishing and taking in the whole range of human thought and feeling. He was several men all in one. Multitudinous but not multiplex—in him odd and apparently incongruous notions dwelt peaceably together. The lion lay down with the lamb. Voluntaryism and an endowment—both were best.

He was *childlike* in his simplicity :—though in understanding a full-grown man—he was himself a child in many things. Coleridge says, every man should include all his former selves in his present—as a tree has its former years' growths inside its last—so Dr. Chalmers bore along with him his childhood, his youth, his early, and full manhood into his mature old age—this gave himself, we doubt not, infinite delight—multiplied his joys, strengthened and sweetened his whole nature, and kept his heart young and tender, and in tune—it enabled him to sympathize, to have a fellow-feeling with all, of whatever age. Those who best knew him, who were most habitually with him, know how beautifully this point of his character shone out in daily, hourly life. We well remember long ago loving him before we had seen him—from our having been told, that being out one Saturday at a friend's house near the Pentlands, he collected all the children and small people,—the *other* bairns, as he called them—and with no one else of larger growth, took the lead to the nearest hill-top—how he made each take the biggest and roundest stone he could find, and carry—how he panted up the hill with one of enormous size himself—how he kept up their hearts, and made them shout with glee—with the light of his countenance, and with all his pleasant and strange ways and words—how having got the breathless little men and women to the top of the hill, he, hot and scant of breath—looked round on the world and upon them with his broad benignant smile like the *αναριθμον κυματων γελασμα*—the unnumbered laughter of the sea—how he set off his own huge “fellow”—how he watched him setting out on his race,—slowly, stupidly, vaguely at first, almost as if he might die before he began to live,—then suddenly giving a spring and off like a shot—bounding, tearing, *vires acquirens eundo* ; how the great and good man was *totus in illo* ; how he spoke to the big “fellow,” upbraided him, cheered him, gloried in him, all but prayed for him—how he joked philosophy to his wondering and ecstatic crew, when he (the stone) disappeared among some brackens—telling them they had the evidence of their senses that he was in ; they might even know he was there by his effects, by the moving brackens, though himself unseen ; how plain it became that he had gone in, when

he actually came out! how he ran up the opposite side a bit, and then fell back, and lazily expired at the bottom—how to their astonishment, but not displeasure—for he “set them off so well,” and “was so funny”—he took from each his cherished stone, and set it off himself! showing them how they all ran alike, yet differently; how he went on, “making,” as he said, “an induction of particulars,” till he came to the Benjamin of the flock, a *wee wee* man, who had brought up a stone bigger than his own big head; then how he let him set off his own, and how wonderfully it ran! what miraculous leaps! what escapes from impossible places! and how it went further up the other side, and by some fine felicity remained there.

HE WAS AN ORATOR in its specific and highest sense. We need not prove this to those who have heard him—we cannot to those who have not. It was a living man sending living, burning words into the minds and hearts of men before him, radiating his intense fervour upon them all; but there was no reproducing the entire effect when alone and cool; some one of the elements was gone. We say nothing of this part of his character, because upon this all are agreed. His eloquence rose like a tide, a sea, setting in, bearing down upon you, lifting up all its waves—“deep calling unto deep”—there was no doing any thing but giving yourself up for the time to its will. Do our readers remember Horace's description of Pindar?

“Monte decurrens velut amnis, imbres
 Quem super notas aluere ripas
 Fervet, immensusque ruit, profundo
 Pindarus ore :
 ——‘per audaces nova dithyrambos
 Verba devolvit numerisque fertur
 Lege solutis.’”

This is to our mind singularly characteristic of our perfervid Scotsman. If we may indulge our conceit, we would paraphrase it thus. His eloquence was like a flooded Scottish river,*—it had

* We have called our Chalmers a *Scottish river*. He was thoroughly *national* in look, in feeling, in heart, in *perfection*. In connexion with this, we remember, many years ago, when we were, as youngsters are, more o'er-informed with phantasy, with some few of our companions setting ourselves to compare the great poets to musical instruments. Milton was an organ, with a trumpet *obbligato*—a “loud, uplifted, angel trumpet”—“with ever and anon, and shutting up his passages, a “seven-fold chorus of hallelujahs and harping symphonies,”—“bringing all heaven before our eyes,”—“the thunderous throne,”—and making us conscious of Him “who sits thereon.”

Shakspeare was a violin—and all who know what it can do and be, under the fingers and soul of a master—how it can unbind the hidden springs of harmony,—knows this is the only not unfit emblem of him, “who, in our wonder and astonish-

its origin in some great and exalted region—in some mountain-truth—some high, immutable reality; it did not rise in a plain, and quietly drain its waters to the sea,—it came sheer down from above. He got hold of some simple truth—the love of God, the Divine method of justification, the unchangeableness of human nature, the supremacy of conscience, the honourableness of all men; and having got this vividly before his mind, on he moved—the river rose at once, drawing everything into his course—

“All thoughts, all passions, all desires,—
Whatever stirs this mortal frame,”

things outward and things inward, interests immediate and remote—God and eternity—men, miserable and immortal—this world and the next—clear light and unsearchable mystery—the word and the works of God—everything contributed to swell the volume, and add to the onward and widening flood. His river did not flow like Denham's Thames,—

“Strong without rage, without o'erflowing full;
Though deep yet clear, though gentle yet not dull.”

There was strength, but likewise rage; a fine frenzy—there was, owing chiefly to its rapidity and to its being raised by his affections, often in the stream of his thoughts, some confusion; some overflowing of the banks; some turbulence, and a certain noble immensity;—*but its origin was clear and calm*, above the region of clouds and storms. If you saw it; if you took up and admitted entirely his proposition—his starting idea, then all else moved on; but once set agoing, once on his way, there

ment, hath built himself a livelong monument,”—clear, spiritual—powerful, but not by reason of its loudness,—human in its speech, in its sorrow—angelic in its singing—quiring to the young-eyed cherubim—this moment touching us to the quick, the next soothing, and then down into the depths of despair, of wrath, of gentleness. Nimble, self-possessed, possessing everything,—like Ariel, circling the world, and unlike him, through it, and the hearts of men—quick, lambent, devouring, shooting up as flame—fresh, insinuating, liquid as water.

We came to Burns; all were at a loss. At last “B——,” our beloved “B——,” who is now long since dead and gone—a *socius*, “a fellow of infinite humour, of most excellent fancy”—but of too deep and keen affections, and too frail a form, for this rough, coarse, wearing, tearing world—suddenly said, “Burns was a great Eolian harp, played on by a Scottish mountain air;” adding, (for he was an inveterate wag,) “and playing it over again with variations.” We felt it to be true—an Eolian harp and a *Scottish* mountain air. Strong, shrewd, native—whispering now, thundering now, laughing, as who could laugh? then wailing, heart-broken, like a lamb seeking at night her lost mother; now running races in his mirth,—and like “an unseen labourer whistling at his work;” now visiting and refreshing the crimson tips of the daisy; now filling the daffodillies' cups with tears; wayward—coming and going as he listed, or as the place he moved along or down might shape his way; now lifting madly his voice against the heavens; now singing the praises of their Eternal King.

was no pausing to inquire, why or how,—*fervet—ruit—fertur*,—he boils—he rushes—he is borne along; and so are all who hear him.

To go on with our figure—There was no possibility of sailing up his stream. You must go with him, or you must go ashore. This was a great peculiarity with him, and puzzled many people. You could argue with him, and get him to entertain your ideas on any purely abstract or simple proposition,—at least for a time; but once let him get down among practicals, among applications of principles, into the regions of the affections and active powers, and such was the fervour and impetuosity of his nature, that he could not stay leisurely to argue; he could not then entertain the opposite; it was hurried off, and made light of, and disregarded, like a floating thing before a cataract.

To play a little more with our conceit—The greatest man is he who is both born and made—who is at once poetical and scientific—who has genius and talents—each supporting the other. So with rivers. Your mighty world's river rises in high places, among the everlasting hills; amidst clouds, or inaccessible clearness. On he moves, gathering to himself all waters; refreshing, cheering all lands. Here a cataract, there a rapid; now lingering in some corner of beauty and strength, as if loath to go. Now shallow and wide, laughing in his glee—now deep, and silent, and slow—now narrow, and rapid, and deep, and not to be meddled with. Now in the open country; not so clear, for other waters have come in upon him, and he is becoming useful; no longer turbulent,—travelling more contentedly; now he is *navigable*, craft of all kinds, big and little, coming and going upon his surface for ever; and then, as if by some gentle and great necessity, “deep and smooth, passing with a still foot and a sober face,” he pays his last tribute to the *Fiscus*, the great Exchequer, the sea—running out fresh, by reason of his power and volume, into the main for many a league; not lost, when he dies.

Your mere genius, who has instincts, and is poetical, and not scientific, who grows from within—chiefly by increase, not accretion—he is like our mountain river, clear, wilful, odd; running round corners; disappearing it may be under ground, coming up again quite unexpectedly, and quite strong, as if fed from some unseen spring, deep down in darkness; rising without warning, and coming down like a lion; often all but dry; never to be trusted to for driving mills; must at least be tamed and led off to the mill; and going down full pace, and without stop or stay, into the sea.

Your man of talents, of acquirements, of science—who is made; who is not so much educed as edified; who, instead of acquiring

his *vires eundo*, gets his *vires eundi*, from acquirement, and grows from without; who serves his brethren and is useful; he rises often no one knows where; has perhaps no proper fountain at all, but is the result of the gathered rain water in the higher flats; he is never quite clear, never brisk, never dangerous; always from the first useful, and goes pleasantly in harness; turns mills; washes rags—makes them into paper; carries down all manner of dye-stuffs and omnigenous feculence; and turns a bread-mill to as good purpose as any clearer stream; is docile, and has, as he reaches the sea, in his dealings with the world, a river trust, who look after his and their own interests, and dredge him, and deepen him, and manage him, and turn him off into docks, and he is in the sea before he or you know it,—indeed, the sea comes up to him.

Though we do not reckon the *imagination* of Dr. Chalmers among his master faculties, it was powerful, effective, magnificent. It did not move him, he took it up as he went along; its was not that imperial, penetrating, transmuting function that we find it in Dante, in Jeremy Taylor, in Milton, or in Burke; he used it to emblazon his great central truths, to hang like luminous clouds on the skirts of his illustration; but it was too passionate, too material, too encumbered with images, too involved in the general *mêlée* of the soul, to do its work as a master. It was not in him, as Thomas Fuller calls it, “that inward sense of the soul, its most boundless and restless faculty—for while the understanding and the will are kept as it were in *libera custodia* to their objects of *verum et bonum*, it is free from all engagements—digs without spade, flies without wings, builds without charges, in a moment striding from the centre to the circumference of the world by a kind of omnipotency, creating and annihilating things in an instant—restless, ever working, never wearied.” We may say, indeed, that men of his temperament are not generally endowed with this power in largest measure—in one sense they can do without it, in another they want the conditions on which its highest exercise depends. Plato, and Milton, and Shakspeare, and Dante, and Wordsworth, had imaginations tranquil, sedate, cool, originate, penetrative, which dwelt in the “highest heaven of invention,” “above the smoke and stir of this dim spot which men call earth.” Thus it was that Chalmers could personify or paint a passion; he could give it in one of its actions; he could not, or rather he never did empathize, create, and vivify a person—a very different thing from personifying a passion—all the difference between Byron and Shakspeare.

In his impetuosity, we find the rationale of much that is peculiar in the style of Dr. Chalmers. As a spoken style it was

thoroughly effective.* He seized the nearest weapons, and smote down whatever he hit. But from this very vehemence, this haste, there was in his general style a want of correctness, of selectness, of nicety, of that curious felicity which makes thought immortal, and enshrines it in imperishable crystal. In the language of the affections he was singularly happy; but, in a formal statement, rapid argumentation and analysis, he was often as we might think, uncouth, and imperfect, and incorrect; chiefly owing to his temperament, to his fiery, impatient, swelling spirit—this gave his orations their fine audacity—this brought out hot from the furnace, his new words—this made his numbers run wild—*lege solutis*. We are sure this view will be found confirmed by these “Daily Readings,” when he wrote little at a time, and had not time to get heated—and when the nature of the work, the time at which it was done, and his solitariness, made his thoughts flow at their “own sweet will,”—they are often quite as classical in expression, as they are deep and lucid in thought—reflecting heaven with its clouds and stars, and letting us see deep down into its own secret depths—this is to us one great charm of these volumes.—Here he is broad and calm—in his great public performances by mouth and pen, he soon passed from the lucid into the luminous.

What, for instance, can be finer in expression than this? “It

* We have not noticed his iterativeness, his reiterativeness, because it flowed naturally from his primary qualities. In speaking it was effective, and to us pleasing, because there was some new modulation, some addition in the manner, just as the sea never sets up one wave exactly like the last or the next. But in his books it did somewhat encumber his thoughts and the reader's progress and profit. It did not arise, as in many lesser men, from his having said his say—from his having no more in him; much less did it arise from conceit, either of his idea or of his way of stating it; but from the intensity with which the sensation of the idea—if we may use the expression—made its first mark on his mind. Truth to him never seemed to lose its first freshness, its edge, its flavour; and Divine truth, we know, had come to him so suddenly, so fully, at mid-day, when he was in the very prime of his knowledge, and his power, and quickness—had so possessed his entire nature, as if, like him who was journeying to Damascus, a Great Light had shone round about him—that whenever he reproduced that condition, he began afresh, and with his whole utterance, to proclaim it. He could not but speak the things he had seen, and felt, and heard, and believed; and he did it much in the same way, and in the same words, for the thoughts and affections and posture of his soul were the same. Like all men of vivid perception and keen sensibility, his mind and his body continued under impressions, both material and spiritual, after the objects were gone. A curious instance of this occurs to us. Some years ago, he roamed up and down through the woods near Auchindinny, with two boys as companions. It was the first burst of summer, and the trees were more than usually enriched with leaves. He wandered about delighted, silent, looking at the leaves, “thick and numberless.” As the three went on, they came suddenly upon a high brick wall, newly built, for peach trees, not yet planted. Dr. Chalmers halted, and looking stedfastly at the wall, exclaimed most earnestly, “What foliage! what foliage!” The boys looked at one another, and said nothing; but on getting home, expressed their astonishment at this very puzzling phenomenon. What a difference! Leaves and parallelograms—a forest and a brick wall!

is well to be conversant with great elements—life and death, reason and madness.” “God forgets not his own purposes, though he executes them in his own way, and maintains his own pace, which he hastens not and shortens not to meet our impatience.” “I find it easier to apprehend the greatness of the Deity than any of his moral perfections, or his sacredness ;” and this—

“One cannot but feel an interest in Ishmael—figuring him to be a noble of nature—one of those heroes of the wilderness who lived on the produce of his bow, and whose spirit was nursed and exercised among the wild adventures of the life he led. And it does soften our conception of him whose hand was against every man, and every man's hand against him, when we read of his mother's influence over him, in the deference of Ishmael to whom we read another example of the respect yielded to females even in that so-called barbarous period of the world. There was a civilisation, the immediate effect of religion, in these days, from which men fell away as the world grew older.”

That he had a keen relish for material and moral beauty and grandeur we all know—what follows shows that he had also the true ear for beautiful words, as at once pleasant to the ear and suggestive of some higher feelings :—“I have often felt in reading Milton and Thomson, a strong poetical effect in the bare enumeration of different countries, and this strongly enhanced by the statement of some common and prevailing emotion, which passed from one to another.” This is set forth with great beauty and power in verses 14th and 15th of Exodus xv.,—The people shall hear and be afraid—sorrow shall take hold on the inhabitants of Palestina. Then the Dukes of Edom shall be amazed—the mighty men of Moab, trembling shall take hold of them—the inhabitants of Canaan will melt away. Any one who has a tolerable ear and any sensibility, must remember the sensation of delight in the mere sound—like the colours of a butterfly's wing, or the shapeless glories of evening clouds, to the eye—in reading aloud such passages as these : Heshbon shall cry and Elealeh—their voice shall be heard to Jabez—for by the way of Luhith with weeping shall they go it up—for in the way of Horonaim they shall raise a cry. God came from Teman, the Holy One from Mount Paran. Is not Calno as Carchemish ? is not Hamath as Arpad ? is not Samaria as Damascus ? He is gone to Aiath, he is passed to Migron ; at Michmash he hath laid up his carriages : Ramath is afraid ; Gibeah of Saul is fled—Lift up thy voice, O daughter of Gallim : cause it to be heard unto Laish, O poor Anathoth. Madmenah is removed ; the inhabitants of Gebim gather themselves to flee. The fields of Heshbon languish—the vine of Sibmah—I will water thee with my tears,

O Heshbon and Elcaleh. Any one may prove to himself that much of the effect and beauty of these passages depends on these names—put others in their room, and try them.

We remember well our first hearing Dr. Chalmers. We were in a moorland district in Tweeddale, rejoicing in the country, after nine months of the High School. We heard that the famous preacher was to be at a neighbouring parish church, and off we set, a cartful of irrepressible youngsters. "Calm was all nature as a resting wheel." The crows, instead of making wing, were impudent and sat still; the cart-horses were standing, knowing the day, at the field-gates, gossiping and gazing, idle and happy; the moor was stretching away in the pale sun-light—vast, dim, melancholy, like a sea; everywhere were to be seen the gathering people, "sprinklings of blithe company;" the country-side seemed moving to some one centre. As we entered the kirk we saw a notorious character, a drover, who had much of the brutal look of what he worked in, with the knowing eye of a man of the city, a sort of big Peter Bell—

"He had a hardness in his eye,
He had a hardness in his cheek."

He was our terror, and we not only wondered, but were afraid when we saw *him* going in. The kirk was full as it could hold. How different in looks to a brisk town congregation! There was a fine leisureliness and vague stare; all the dignity and vacancy of animals; eyebrows raised, and mouths open, as is the habit with those who speak little, and look much, and at far off objects. The minister comes in, homely in his dress and gait, but having a great look about him, like a mountain among hills. The High School boys thought him like a "big one of ourselves," he looking vaguely round upon his audience, as if he saw in it *one great object, not many*. We shall never forget his smile! its general benignity;—how he let the light of his countenance fall on us. He read a few verses quietly; then prayed briefly, solemnly, with his eyes wide open all the time, but not seeing. Then he gave out his text; we forget it, but its subject was, "Death reigns." He stated slowly, calmly, the simple meaning of the words; what death was, and how and why it reigned; then suddenly he started, and looked like a man who had seen some great sight, and was breathless to declare it; he told us how death reigned—everywhere, at all times, in all places; how we all knew it, how we would yet know more of it. The drover, who had sat down in the table-seat opposite, was gazing up in a state of stupid excitement; he seemed restless, but never kept his eye from the speaker. The tide set in—everything added to

its power, deep called to deep, imagery and illustration poured in; and every now and then the theme,—the simple, terrible statement, was repeated in some lucid interval. After overwhelming us with proofs of the reign of Death, and transferring to us his intense urgency and emotion; and after shrieking, as if in despair, these words, “Death is a tremendous necessity,”—he suddenly looked beyond us as if into some distant region, and cried out, “Behold a mightier!—who is this? He cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah, glorious in his apparel, speaking in righteousness, travelling towards men in the greatness of his strength, mighty to save.” Then, in a few plain sentences, he stated the truth as to sin entering, and death by sin, and death passing upon all. Then he took fire once more, and enforced, with redoubled energy and richness, the freeness, the simplicity, the security, the sufficiency of the great method of justification. How astonished and impressed we all were! He was at the full thunder—the whole man was in an agony of earnestness. The drover was weeping like a child, the tears running down his ruddy, coarse cheeks—his face opened out and smoothed like an infant’s; his whole body stirred with emotion. We all had insensibly been drawn out of our seats, and were converging towards the wonderful speaker. And when he sat down, after warning each one of us to remember who it was, and what it was, that followed death on his pale horse,* and how alone we could escape—we all sunk back into our seats. How beautiful to our eyes did the thunderer look—exhausted—but sweet and pure! How he poured out his soul before his God in giving thanks for sending the Abolisher of Death! Then, a short psalm, and all was ended.

We went home quieter than we came—we did not recount the foals with their long legs, and roguish eyes, and their sedate mothers; we did not speculate upon whose dog *that* was, and whether *that* was a crow or a man in the dim moor—we thought of other things. That voice, that face; those great simple living thoughts; those floods of resistless eloquence; that piercing shattering voice,—“that tremendous necessity.”

Were we desirous of giving to one who had never seen or heard Dr. Chalmers an idea of what manner of man he was—what he was as a whole—in the full round of his notions, tastes, affections, and powers—we would put this book into their hands, and ask them to read it slowly, bit by bit, as he wrote it. In it he puts down simply, and at once, what passes through his mind

* * “And I looked, and behold a pale horse; and his name that sat on him was Death, and Hell followed with him.”—Rev. vi. 8.

as he reads—there is no making of himself feel and think—no getting into a frame of mind—he was not given to frames of mind—he preferred states to forms—substances to circumstances. There is something of everything in it—his relish for abstract thought—his love of sounding depths and finding no bottom—his knack of starting subtle questions, which he did not care to run to earth—his penetrating, regulating godliness—his delight in nature—his turn for politics—general, economical, and ecclesiastical—his picturesque eye—his humanity—his inherent courtesy—his warm-heartedness—his impetuosity—his sympathy in all the wants, and pleasures, and sorrows of his kind—past, present, and to come—his delight in the law of God, and his simple, devout, manly treatment of it—his acknowledgment of difficulties—his turn for the sciences of quantity and number, and indeed for natural science and art generally—his shrewdness—his worldly wisdom—his genius;—all these come out—you gather them like fruit—here a little and there a little. He goes over the Bible, not as a philosopher, or a theologian, or a historian, or a geologist, or a jurist, or a naturalist, or a statist, or a politician—picking out all that he wants, and a great deal more than he has any business with, and leaving everything else as barren to his reader as it has been to himself—but he looks abroad upon his Father's *word*—as he used so pleasantly to do on his *world*—as a man, and as a Christian; he submits himself to its influences, and lets his mind go out fully and naturally in its utterances. It is this which gives to this work all the charm of multitude in unity, of variety in harmony; and that sort of unexpectedness and ease of movement which we see everywhere in nature and in natural men.

We give at random a few extracts:—

SABBATH EXERCISES.

“What a damper to spirituality—what a rude extinguisher on all its feelings and contemplations is sin! An unforeseen gust of anger will put them all to flight; and the objective truth is lost in that disturbed and so darkened medium by which the subjective mind is encompassed. There is one lesson, however, to be gathered from the connexion which obtains between obedience and spiritual discernment on the one hand, between disobedience and spiritual dimness or obscurity on the other. A strict and conscientious perseverance in the walk of known duty may at length conduct to those manifestations after which we aspire—or, in other words, the humble doings of our every-day obedience may prove a stepping-stone to the higher experiences of the divine life. Certain it is, that to cast off this obedience is to cut away the first round of the ascending ladder; and so to make a commencement impossible.”—P. xix.

"Enlighten me, O God. Open the eyes of my understanding. Deliver me from the power of fantasies in religion. Let mine be a solid faith, exercised on those stable realities which are sought for and discovered only in the medium of Thy Word. I would learn of Thy holy oracles. I would take the sayings of the Bible simply and purely as they are, and exercise myself on the trueness of these sayings."—P. xx.

"In my aspirations after spiritual light, let me remember that it sufficeth not to look objectively at the truths which are without me—if subjectively I have nothing to look with but a dim or diseased organ of perception. It is not enough that there be steadfastness of gaze. There must be singleness of eye—inasmuch that on this last condition it turns that the whole body is full of light."—P. xx.

"Many attempts have I made to obtain more adequate notions than I possess of the Deity; but there is none in which I better succeed than when I aim at an intense recognition of the subject and filial relation in which I stand to Him when simply regarded as my Maker. It is not on the strength of any remote or recondite contemplations that I expect to grow in fruitful acquaintance with Him—but by the stepping-stone of such thoughts as might be apprehended by babes—but still which neither babes nor philosophers will apprehend to any practical effect, till the Spirit brings them home."—Pp. xxiii, xxiv.

"Let me apprehend the truths of Scripture simply—let me believe them surely; and the mind, when thus occupied, will be rightly set. I am restless and dissatisfied without God."—P. xxiv.

"Let me conform myself more and more unto the *mediatorial* economy of the Gospel. Let my fellowship be with the Son as well as with the Father."—P. xxix.

"I know no passage in Scripture that gives a clearer and more decisive warrant to a simply objective faith, than Heb. vi. 17-20. The hope is grounded, not on aught that is within, but on that which is independent of us, and external to us—the truth of God, the immutability of His counsel, the faithfulness of His promise, strengthened by this double guarantee that He has not only said it but sworn it. We do not steady a ship by fixing the anchor on aught that is within the vessel. The anchorage must be without the vessel; and so of the soul, when resting, not on what it sees in itself, but on what it sees in the character of God—the certainty of His truth, the impossibility of His falsehood. Thus may I cast the anchor of my hope on the Foundation which God Himself hath laid in Zion—laying hold and taking refuge, not in the hope that I find to be in me, but in the hope that is set before me. I know that there is a legitimate hope, too, in the consciousness of a work of grace within me; but the primary hope, the beginning of our confidence, is of altogether an objective character, and respects God in Christ reconciling the world, and not imputing unto them their trespasses. Simplify and strengthen this confidence; and make it every day more sure and steadfast, O my God."—P. xxx, xxxi.

"In solitude and stillness—but with a heart sadly prone to wander from the Fountain of light and life—made sad exhibitions of my

natural infirmity—impatience in opposition to the long-suffering of the Spirit under the manifold interruptions of Edinburgh. Where is my slowness to wrath?—where the approach in the way of resemblance or imitation to the characteristics of Godhead? and where, alas! a prevailing sense of God, so as to make Him the guide, and the master, and the arbiter of all my doings?”—P. xxxvi.

“I find it easier to apprehend the greatness of the Divinity, than any of his moral perfections, or his sacredness; yet even the former were an elevating thought; and let us be thankful if at any time, and according to any view of Him, if just, we can attain to a realizing sense of God.”—P. xl.

DAILY SCRIPTURE READINGS.

“Let me make this use of the information that God made man in His own image. Let it cure me of the scepticism which distrusts man’s instinctive beliefs or perceptions. Let me recollect that in knowledge or understanding we are like unto God—and that in His light we see light. He would not practise a mockery upon us by giving us constitutional beliefs at variance with the objective reality of things, and so as to distort all our views of Truth and of the Universe. We were formed in His image intellectually as well as morally; nor would He give us the arbitrary structure that would lead us irresistibly to believe a lie. When men deny the objective reality of space or time, I take refuge in the thought that my view of them must be the same in kind at least, though not so perfect in degree, as that of God—or of Him who sees all things as they are, and cannot possibly be the subject of any illusion.”—Pp. 2, 3.

“The flood was miraculous; but it is remarkable that God is sparing of miracles, and seems to prefer the ordinary processes of nature, if equally effectual, for the accomplishment of His purposes. He might have saved Noah and his family by miracles; but he is not prodigal of these, and so He appointed that an ark should be made to bear up the living cargo, which was to be kept alive, on the surface of the waters; and not only so, but He respects the laws of the animal physiology, as he did those of hydrostatics, in that He put them by pairs into the ark, male and female, to secure their transmission to after ages, and food was stored up to sustain them during their long confinement. In short, He dispenses with miracles when these are not requisite for the fulfilment of His ends; and He never dispenses with the ordinary means, when these are fitted and at the same time sufficient for the occasion.”—Pp. 10, 11.

“Mark here, as in many places of the Bible, the free and fearless ascription of a righteousness to Noah of which we should most naturally and readily conceive that it was a personal righteousness, and in consideration of which God saved him from the flood that came upon the world of the ungodly. This should not be explained away, as it often is by an ultra and over-anxious orthodoxy.”—P. 11.

“The approval and the reward which Abraham met with from God for his obedience, should relax the antipathies of that ultra-rigorous orthodoxy which looks frowningly on works, and would almost seem

to forbid the performance of them. I fear that the effect of controversy and system in Theology has been to work a mal-adjustment between our minds and the representations of Scripture, which will not be compelled into an accommodation with the artificial compends or creeds of any denomination. A remarkable example is the jealousy wherewith the disciples of the Evangelical School look on service, lest faith should suffer derogation thereby. In what perfect harmony do these two elements meet in the character of Abraham, who may be said to have personified the composition of the two, and is accordingly claimed and appealed to alike by two Apostles—by one when he is setting forth the part which faith, and by the other when he is setting forth the part which works have in our salvation.”—Pp. 38, 39.

“I have long been impressed with the dignified politeness of the Patriarch as laid before us in this passage—with the discourses he made to the people of the land, and the repetition of which, as given in verse twelfth, falls on my ear with the cadence and effect of high poetry. There is nothing in the etiquette of Courts and Parliaments, or in any of our forms of highest breeding, which so powerfully expresses the respect of man for his fellows. This, too, would make an admirable subject for the pencil.”—Pp. 39, 40.

“The various particulars of this transaction evince very considerable progress at that early period in economics, in commerce, in law. There is money, and of a given denomination or coin—balances for weighing it—a standard thereof, such as was current with the merchant—a superiority therefore in the methods of trade above the way of barter—forms in the conveyance and exchange of property before witnesses, as here in the audience of the people of Heth—the terms and specifications of a bargain, by which its several particulars were made sure to Abraham in the presence of and before many witnesses;—all serving to confirm the doctrine that the progress in these days was from an original civilization down to barbarism—the civilization being coeval with the first and earliest revelations, or with Adam himself. A thorough attention to these early chapters of Genesis confirms our belief in this tenet—supported as it is by this very strong negative argument, that a nation was never known to emerge simultaneously and unaided from the savage state—the civilization thereof having always, as far as is known, originated in or been aided by a movement or influence from without.”—Pp. 40, 41.

The Death of Abraham :—

“The death of this truly magnificent personage—whose biography is altogether worthy of the Father of the Faithful—is recorded in suitable terms of venerable simplicity, quite in keeping with his character as the greatest of the Patriarchs. He gave up the ghost, died in a good old age, an old man full of years, and, most touching of all, both in simplicity and force—was gathered to his people. I feel convinced from the effect of my now more special attention, in sections and piecemeal, to the Bible, that I become far more intimate than before with the character of its recorded personages; and have

no doubt that the biography of Scripture, if more fully studied would be found not only replete with moral instruction, but would contribute to build up a distinct evidence for the truth of Scripture."—P. 46.

"How I love the cadence of such descriptions as are given in the instances both of Abraham and Ishmael of their respective latter ends—gathered unto his people!"—P. 47.

"Then follows the announcement of that great and solemn interview, when, from the flaming top of Sinai, the tokens of a present Divinity were held forth in the sight of all Israel. Moses acted the part of a messenger or mediator between God and the people—conveying to them the words which he had heard, and carrying back their promises and engagements of obedience. This coming of the Lord in a thick cloud, was expressly for the purpose of their hearing the voice which issued therefrom, and so believing in Him for ever—the honest purpose of God, though afterwards frustrated by the perversity of man; and thus another exemplification of that mystery which will never be dissipated in this world—a declared and ostensible purpose of the Almighty coming short of its fulfilment. Let not our inability to scan the hidden counsel turn us away from the palpable lesson here given of the Divine sacredness—in that the people had to sanctify themselves for this great and solemn occasion, and dare not overpass the prescribed barrier, or come too near to that awful majesty of God, which, within certain limits, was unapproachable."—P. 146.

On the true keeping of the Sabbath—how full of meaning this little sentence is—how well the theological world would do to take this to heart:—

"Let my Sabbath not be a working-day; and even in the things of sacredness, let me not so exercise myself as to violate its character as a day of rest."—P. 182.

"It is delightful to be told, as we are here, of the sufficiency, nay, exuberance of the voluntary principle for the object assigned to it. No argument, however, for an exclusive voluntaryism. It is in striking conformity with human nature that for the erections, as in this instance, of the tabernacle, God should not have imposed a levy upon his worshippers, but drawn on their free-will—whereas for the maintenance of the ecclesiastical labourers a legal provision was instituted. It was thus that we aimed at the prosecution of Church Extension—subscriptions for the places of worship—an endowment for their officiating ministers."—P. 186.

Speaking of the tabernacle, and the minute directions for its fabric and furniture:—

"In the description of these various articles, it is well to observe that there are parts not for use only, but parts which serve no discernible purpose, save that of ornament. The candlestick would practically have answered all its mere utilitarian purposes as well as though there had been neither knops nor flowers; and so too might our

vegetable structures without so rich an efflorescence of gay and variegated blossoms. It is pleasing to contemplate such exhibitions of beauty, as designedly set forth by God to regale the taste and the eye of man. Even our Saviour dignifies this object of the Divine workmanship—when he says of the lilies of the field, that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.”—Pp. 188, 189.

“But the most noticeable thing here is the contribution made by women of their looking-glasses—which in these days were made of polished brass. One likes to meet not only with the characteristic zeal of the sex in things pertaining to sentiment; but with the countenance given to it, and the record made of it.”—P. 189.

“There is a contempt for externals which I hold to be both unscriptural and unphilosophical. Materialism is instinct with sentiment; and there is a power of expression even in dress and drapery, which makes the question of priestly vestments to be not insignificant. And certain it is, that deformity of person is still more revolting than homeliness or shabbiness of attire.”—P. 231.

“To make the Sabbath observance a duty which should terminate in itself, and without regard to its moral influences, is a specimen of the same senseless superstition which would attach a mysterious virtue to the mere *opus operatum* of sacraments and church forms. And the same is true of the imposition of fringes—good as memorials of duty, but utterly superstitious and vain if the mere wearing of them were made the *terminus ad quem* of the observance. It is in kind accommodation to our corporeal nature that such an institution was devised; but separated from its end, it is but an empty ceremonial—even as the Sabbath is when separated from its end.—Let us not forget, O Lord, that the flesh is unprofitable and vain, and that all Thy words are spirit and life.”—P. 281.

“It were well for a philosophical and learned jurist to confront the civil law of the Hebrews given by inspiration, with the laws and usages of the most enlightened nations, and also with the principles of his profession. The principle of prevention by example, as well as of correction and removal in the particular instance, is here adverted to; and the way in which the rule of capital punishment is given forth, along with that of the minor punishment, speaks strongly against those who oppose the penalty of death in all instances whatever.”—P. 356.

“We now come to the last scene in the history of the great Jewish Legislator, who fills so mighty a space in the Old Testament—a noble character, in which great power and great sensibility were most gracefully blended. The glory of God and the good of Israel were the paramount desires and principles of his heart; and such, in particular, was the strength of his patriotic affection for his own countrymen, that it could not be overborne by all their provocations. There must, I should think, have been a miraculous showing of the land to Moses; as, optically, I doubt it must be impossible for any ordinary person to reach such an extent of vision from the top of any hill on the east of Jordan. And yet, as in many other instances, the natural is made to help the miraculous—for if wholly miraculous, why ascend to the top of a mountain at all? The line of demarcation be-

tween these two is by us unknown. The contest of Michael with Satan about the body of Moses, has been theorized upon; but it, too, is an unexplained mystery. . . . The government now passed into delegated and inferior hands; and the Book closes most appropriately, with a testimony to the greatness of Moses, and the honours by which he was signalized. We have now described one great department of Holy Writ—the Pentateuch.”—Pp. 382, 383.

“We must here take leave of good old Joshua, with whom we have companied for many days. May I meet him in Heaven! The people of that generation were faithful to the Lord, and might have transmitted their own loyalty to their children, had they been more observant of Joshua’s purpose, that not only he, but he *and his house*, should serve the Lord. The decay of family religion is the sure precursor of national degeneracy. . . . It is interesting to observe the religious fidelity wherewith they executed the charge which Joseph left behind him respecting his bones. . . . So it was competent for Phinehas to have a property, and that, too, in a territory not assigned to the sons of Aaron.”—P. 422.

We have merely looked into the second volume of the Scripture Readings. They extend to the end of Job, and, as might be expected, are quite equal to, and quite in harmony with the first. That wonderful production of inspired genius—the Book of Job, is here carefully analyzed, its high argument carefully completed, and its interlocutors painted to the life. What a simplicity, depth, and grandeur about that most ancient of Dramatic Poems! In it, tragedy is found to be, as Milton said it ought always to be,—“the gravest, moralest, and most profitable of all poems—being of power, by raising pity, and fear, or terror, to purge the mind of those and such like passions.” Besides its being inspired, and its having in it so much of the mind and the will of the Almighty—where will your men of letters find more, or as much of the “mens divinior,” of the very highest attributes of human genius, as in this story of the Arabian patriarch?

We give a few extracts:—

“Then comes another of the endless rebellions of this people. It is truly instructive to find in their history the verification of the important lesson—the power and ascendancy of an individual mind over the masses. How often do we find both the character and prosperity of the nation to flourish with the presence of a good judge or ruler; and how often their decline in both respects to be associated with the absence of these functionaries. It is true that in the regal part of their history, when the monarchy was never vacant, their degeneracies, and consequent adversities, were associated not with the want of a prince, but with the rule of a bad one, which confirms all the more a law of vast importance in human affairs—the power of single men over large aggregates of their species.”—P. 21.

“Thus terminates the dark and tragical history of Saul. One’s

heart bleeds for him. There were good sensibilities about him, dis-tempered as he was; and carried by the influence of his morbid jealousies and fears to fearful atrocities of conduct. Yet his delinquencies and crimes were the result more of impulses and brooding imaginations than of aught like deep or deliberate villany. His sun set in darkness on Mount Gilboa, where the sorely wounded man put an end to his own life, and with his own hand made over his dead body to the wanton outrage of his enemies. What a degradation to Israel, to have the mangled relics of their monarch set forth in triumph from the wall of one of their own captured towns, now in possession of the idolatrous Philistines! . . . Jabesh-gilead stands signalized now for the third time in Scripture history. It here repairs the disgrace which had fallen upon it from not joining with the rest of Israel in wiping off the national scandal that had been inflicted by the tribe of Benjamin. Their present exploit was a high act of patriotism and honour . . . What a catastrophe for poor Jonathan—one of the most truly loveable of our Scripture characters! Had his life been spared, it might have told on the future history of the nation, and certainly not so as to harmonize with the designs of that wise Providence which withdrew him from the scene.”—Pp. 89, 90.

“In the clothing of his neck with thunder, the very indefiniteness of the image adds to the immense power; nor can we figure a more gorgeous and impressive picture than is here given of this noble creature—it must be left to speak for itself; and the argument passes on to other exemplifications, as the hawk poisoning herself in the air, and cleaving it with a power which man is unable to comprehend, and far less to imitate. The description closes with the eagle, king of the birds, and with whom there stands associated so many lofty and commanding images—as the elevated crag in which it builds its nest, the munition of those rocks where it dwells and rears up its young, the pride of its superiority over all other tenants of the air, whom it holds in perpetual subjection and terror, and seizes upon for its prey. The force of her far-seeing eye, and the ravenous appetite both of herself and her young ones for blood, are here powerfully depicted—all serving to enhance our view of the littleness of man in comparison with the God who made all and sustains all.”—P. 473.

“And having affirmed all things to be His, He returns to the leviathan; and we are here presented with a truly magnificent description of him. It is most interesting to mark this delighted contemplation by God of His own works—thus stamping a warrant of sacredness on our tasteful admiration of them—as of the parts, and the power, and the comely proportion of this noble creature. Who can approach or come so near as to put the bridle into him? . . . What a *vis poetica* in the trait of his laughing at the shaking of a spear! So impenetrable is the lining of his body that he can lie with ease on the sharp stones that are under him, or as if in ostentation of his hardness, is represented as spreading them beneath him upon the mire. And the effect of his movement in the waters is given with great strength of imagery and expression—raising such a commotion there as to make the sea like a boiling pot. The electric luminousness that

is excited by these agitations is here again adverted to ; and there is immense power in the feature that "one would think the deep to be hoary." It is made white and foamy, like curled and white hair, by the number of bells which ascend from his path, and by which, though himself unseen, one might trace his progress through the deep. Altogether he is unrivalled, and stands in fear of nothing—the proudest of the proud, or one so superior in strength and greatness to the proud ones of the earth that they might well be humbled in the contemplation of him. There are various conjectures respecting leviathan, whether he be whale or crocodile. It is truly a gorgeous representation that is here given of him ; nor is the last trait the least impressive, where he is represented as looking down upon all things, and as king over all the children of pride."—Pp. 476, 477.

We leave our readers now, recommending them all to get this book—if they have families, to get several copies. They will not find in it a museum of antiquities, and curiosities, and laborious trifles ; nor of scientific specimens, analyzed to the last degree, and all standing in order, labelled and useless. They will not find in it an armory for fighting with and destroying their neighbours. They will get less of the physic of controversy than of the diet of holy living. They will find much of what Lord Bacon desired, when he said—"We want short, sound, and judicious notes upon Scripture, without running into common-places, pursuing controversies, or reducing those notes to artificial method, but leaving them quite loose and native. For certainly, as those wines which flow from the first treading of the grape are sweeter and better than those forced out by the press, which gives them the roughness of the husk and the stone, so are those doctrines best and sweetest which flow from a gentle crush of the Scriptures, and are not wrung into controversies and common-places." They will find it as a large, pleasant garden,—like the first and best garden—natural ; no great system ; not trim, but beautiful, and in which there are things pleasant to the eye as well as good for food,—flowers and fruit, and a few good esculent, wholesome roots. There are Honesty, Thrift, Eye-bright, (Euphrasy that cleanses the sight,) Heart's-ease. The good seed in abundance, and the strange mystical Passion-flower ; and in the midst, and seen everywhere, if we but look for it, the Tree of Life, with its twelve manner of fruits,—the very leaves of which are for the healing of the nations. And, perchance, when they take their walk through it at evening time, or at "the sweet hour of prime," they may see a happy, wise, beaming old man, at his work there—they may hear his well-known voice ; and if they have their spiritual senses exercised as they ought, they will not fail to see by his side "one like unto the Son of Man."

- ART. VII.—1. *Report by the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Colonization from Ireland, together with the Minutes of Evidence.* Session 1847.
2. *Emigration—Ireland—The Speech of Lord Monteagle on moving for a Committee in the House of Lords, June 4, 1847.* From HANSARD'S Parliamentary Debates.
3. *Ireland—Its Present Condition and Future Prospects.* By ROBERT MURRAY, Esq. Dublin, M'Glashan. 1847.
4. *A Few Remarks and Suggestions on the Present State of Ireland.* By the MARQUIS of SLIGO. 1847.
5. *English Misrule and Irish Misdeeds.* By AUBREY DE VERE, Esq. 1848.

It is scarcely possible to estimate too highly the value of the evidence already placed upon record by the Select Committee of the House of Lords, appointed early in June 1847, "to consider the means by which Colonization may be made subsidiary to other measures for the improvement of the social condition of Ireland; and by which, with full regard to the interests of the Colonies themselves, the comfort and prosperity of those who emigrate may be effectually promoted." The extent and importance of the subjects referred to their consideration, rendered it impossible for them to complete their inquiries at the time their First Report, of which we propose to give an account, was presented. During the months of June and July 1847, they examined several witnesses respecting the state of Ireland, of the British North American Colonies, the West India Islands, New South Wales, Port Phillip, South Australia, Van Dieman's Land, and New Zealand. In October last, their First Report, with Minutes of the oral evidence, was printed, and an Appendix has been since issued, consisting chiefly of documentary evidence supplied by the different witnesses whom they examined. "On some of these points," they tell us, "their inquiries have little more than commenced, on others they have been carried somewhat nearer to completion, but in no case can it be considered that the subject is as yet exhausted."

This Report gives us no means of conjecturing what may be the final recommendation of the Committee on a subject involving considerations so various and so important. The terms, however, of the Commission imply that Colonization is to be considered as subsidiary to other measures for the improvement of Ireland, and that the interest of the Colonies, as well as that of the emigrants, is to form a part of the investigation. It is therefore unfair to treat the question thus brought before the public as if Colonization were proposed as a substitute for other

measures, to which, by the very language of the reference, it is regarded as subsidiary, and without which, however important to the Colonies and to those proposing to emigrate, it would be confessedly of so little value to the remaining portion of the population of the districts from which emigration might take place, that no one could think of urging the project to any greater extent than providing security to the emigrant from the class of frauds to which the ignorant and ardent are peculiarly exposed, and which it is probable might be prevented by arrangements involving little or no expense in addition to what is at this moment actually incurred, and against which evils it seems the plain duty of the Government to provide. The case made by the oral evidence given before Lord Monteagle's Committee is this:—In many parts of Ireland the population is excessive, and utterly disproportionate to the amount not alone of the actual produce of the soil, but to any possible produce under better modes of cultivation. The removal of a part of that population is absolutely necessary; the land—we do not mean the whole island—but the land on which they have grown up, will no longer support them. This is said to be a landlord question—perhaps rightly; it is, however, in the first instance, a question of the support of the life of those who live upon the land. Whether the potato had continued or had failed, this question for the last quarter of a century has not been essentially different. Where such a population had grown up, the land was undergoing a gradual but sure process of deterioration, and food—even of the potato—it was impossible that it should have long supplied. The population of those districts must have perished, or derived their support from other sources than the land on which they had hitherto lived. The food necessary to sustain human life must have been brought to them, or they to the food. The wandering hordes of beggars described by every traveller in Ireland—men, women, and children, moving in families along all the roads—show how the matter was managed before the Poor Law and Relief systems. The question between their being supported, whether in the Colonies or in the British Islands, by funds not derived from the land on which they have grown up, or suffered to perish, cannot be evaded. The question is practically narrowed to one in which the nominal owner of the lands on which they have grown up has, in many cases, ceased to have an interest. His estate is, in the supposed circumstances, worth nothing. Suppose an effort made to sell it—will land worth nothing bring a price? Is it possible for Poor-law guardians, suppose it transferred to them, or for any one, to make it repay the expense of cultivation, overburthened with such a population? As a mere question of police, antecedent to any detailed evidence of actual crime, is it possible that such a population

can be other than criminal? And—examine the chief cases of outrage that have lately occupied the public mind—is not the evidence they furnish conclusive of the fact? Are not the properties on which this population has grown up the centre of all these disturbances? It is some six months ago since we gave the history of one of these neglected townlands in the county of Roscommon, and we then said—"The land unable to support its poor, will supply multitudes ready for any crime, the plague of the surrounding district."* In the immediate neighbourhood of the townland we were then describing, the murder of Major Mahon has taken place, and more lately that of Mr. Lloyd. In the evidence before the Committee on the Enclosure of Commons (England,) testimony leading to the same conclusion has been given. But the matter, even without evidence, is abundantly clear. If the ground on which a man lives does not give him his food, he must obtain it elsewhere. If he does not obtain it honestly—and, in the case we examine, to obtain it honestly is impossible—then come, according to circumstances, the evils of fraud or of violence. We do not think actual revenge or desperation is as often the cause of these crimes as is imagined. The wish of an indolent and miserable people is to be allowed to continue to live as they have lived. Interference of any kind is resented. A state of law which secures in the possession of land persons with whom no actual contract has been made, and who fulfil no one of the duties of a tenant, favours this wretched state of things, is at the root of all the evils of rural society in Ireland, and does more to confuse all the relations of society there than anything else whatever. This state of things it is utter insanity in the Legislature to allow to continue. It is nowhere better described and illustrated than by Lord Westmeath in a speech delivered in the House of Lords, and since published, with some decisions of the law courts to which it referred. The effect of what he says is lessened by his thinking the courts of law ought to have decided his individual cases on principles different from those which, however unreasonably at first, had yet been fully established by decisions both in England and Ireland, and are, we regret to say, undeniably law. The murder of men of rank will of course fix attention where that of the poor is disregarded; but we imagine as far as motive is concerned—and those murders seem referable more often to distinct calculating motive than to impulse—very much the same state of feeling dictates them. To terminate a tenancy at will, a notice to quit is necessary, and the slightest irregularity in drawing up the notice, or the delay of a day in serving it, gives the tenant another year's possession of the land. This is known by the

* North British Review, vol. vii., p. 528.—*Agrarian Outrages in Ireland.*

occupant who is to be ejected, and the man who is to serve the notices is watched,—the notices are taken from him, or he is bribed not to serve them in proper time. If he be faithful to his employer, he will probably be murdered to prevent the service—if the notices have been served, he will be murdered to prevent the proof of the service. In either case the impulse of revenge has not suggested the proceeding, and many cases of murder of the lower classes were plainly for this purpose alone. In the murders of Major Mahon and Mr. Roe, we trace something of the same feeling. A landlord coming occasionally among those whom he calls his people, determining to see with his own eyes how things are, forcing them as in Major Mahon's case, into earnest activity—providing them with the means of emigration, but saying you shall not live here in sloth, we can well conceive regarded as an unwelcome visitor. Had his exertions been less strenuous, had his tenants feared less interruption of their habits, he would most probably have been safe. In Mr. Roe's case we happen to know with entire certainty that a few weeks before he was murdered he spoke of the folly of thinking there was any danger of a man's life who acted fairly among his tenants, and he said there was no hour of the day or night that he would not go out unarmed among his. The event shows how entirely deceived he was; but at the investigation of the case before the magistrates of Tipperary, it was stated by Lord Suirdale or Lord Glengall, we forget which, that the motive of this murder was, that at Mr. Roe's death, his children being young, the estate would be under the management of the Court of Chancery, and the tenants might deal with it as they pleased. The imputed motive does not appear to us an improbable one, and it is not unlikely that it may have been stated by the Tipperary magistrate on the authority of some information which he could not, consistently with the condition on which such information is in general procured, more distinctly indicate. The interruption of anything with which they are familiar, be it good or evil, is by a neglected tenantry regarded as the great grievance, and this will in every possible way be prevented. A feeling of this kind is common to all classes. It is none other than Man's natural indolence, and its instinct of self-defence. A good man is thus at least as often the object of their attacks as one whose motives are more in accordance with their own modes of thinking. In these overpeopled districts, however, crime most often originates, and in these localities it almost always finds the opportunity of carrying its purposes into effect. "For miles around," says Mr. De Vere,* a resident of the county of Limerick, "the outrages are committed by persons brought from one of these diseased districts. They may have had no personal in-

* Colonization from Ireland—*De Vere* to question 4763.

terest in the matter, but the thing was to be done, and they were the people to do it." As far as Ireland is concerned, it is necessary, as a mere question of police regulation, and unconnected with individual property, which may be described as having ceased to exist in many of those overpeopled districts, to break up the gang of ruffians that have obtained possession of them. The landlord has in many of these cases as little to say to the physical or moral evils existing in this state of society, of which he is made the victim, as the Chapter of Westminster now, or the Bishop of Winchester in the days of old, to the habits of the persons assumed by the old playwrights, to be under his peculiar jurisdiction, or as Dean Merewether himself to the orthodoxy of the Bishop of Hereford. On this part of the case we think the evidence absolutely decisive as far as particular localities are concerned. This leaves undetermined the question of the places to which the redundant population are to be removed—whether to the colonies, or, as some would suggest, to cultivate the waste lands of Ireland, of which, like Sancho's islands, it is assumed there never can be a want for any enterprising projector. A second proposition sought to be established is, the demand for labour in most, if not all, of our colonies; and on this part of the case, the advocates of Colonization also appear to us to have been entirely successful. Before, however, we discuss this, we may describe an important part of the case as already practically decided. In the summer of 1846, the great number of 31,086 emigrants sailed from Irish stations to North America. In 1847, the number was enormously larger; it was 81,658, and this does not include such Irish as sailed from Liverpool, which yet must have added its thousands to the stream of emigration. In previous years, when emigration was confined to persons possessed of some capital, and energy, and intelligence, and before whole multitudes were driven by the scourge of famine from their own shores, flying desolation rather than seeking a home, it might not have seemed altogether unreasonable to have left to his own guidance the emigrant, to pursue, like any other man, an adventure suggested by his own notions of prudence, and to be effected by his own means. The interference of the State, it might be contended, was as little called for to aid a man taking a farm in Canada, as if he had chosen to migrate from Kildare to Donegal, or to pursue any other course regulated by his own views of his own interest. Emigration, it would appear, is now conducted on such a scale that it can no longer be checked, and no longer be regarded as a matter in which the general community is uninterested. Shall it be left to itself? Shall the multitudes, who, whether we wish it or not, are passing to other shores, be left to perish there, or shall the State interfere—not to create, for that is not now the

question—not to stimulate, for the passion that now agitates the multitudes does not require incentives—but to direct this mighty movement to good? Within the last year ten thousand persons have perished of fever in the emigrant vessels, or in quarantine, after their landing in America. Probably without one shilling of additional expense, no matter from what source the funds for their passage were derived—nay, probably, at considerably less expense than attended their own ill-advised arrangements, much of this disease and this suffering might have been spared.*

The excess of labour in Ireland, embarrassing all dealings with land, the want of labour in our colonies, without which their land, absolutely unlimited, must remain unproductive, are the two propositions on which the whole project of Colonization from Ireland to the colonies depends. Assume the case proved, and the question arises as to the sources from which the expense of removing the emigrant and supporting him till he obtains work is to be defrayed. On the estates where such removal is most necessary, there is now no rent whatever paid; the proprietor, as far as these estates are concerned, is wholly unable to bear the expense. On the Irish part of the subject, the evidence of most importance is that of Mr. De Vere, who tells us of “nine Poor-law Unions, which, taken together, contain a population of a quarter of a million of people, with a valuation which affords only twelve shillings to each. To enable paupers to emigrate costs a larger sum, in the first instance, than that which will support them by means of out-door relief during one year: to support them at home for one year, by means of any funds which the land can supply, is, I believe, impossible. It would, therefore, I conclude, be impossible from the land to provide the funds for their emigration.” Yet, as it would seem, Mr. De Vere thinks even property thus circumstanced may ultimately recover, for he proposes loans to the proprietors of such estates for the purpose of emigration—he means for the purpose of encouraging their tenants to emigrate. In such a state of things, many of our readers may think it high time for the proprietor himself to emigrate. Loans are by a late act given to proprietors for purposes of agricultural improvement. Mr. De Vere suggests, that to render these effectual, loans ought at the same time be given for emigration purposes. “Many a man would gladly avail himself of a loan, if allowed to apply half of it to the purpose of emigration, and half to that of improved agriculture, who would deem the latter a hopeless matter if he had not the means of promoting the for-

* “The chief value,” says Lord Durham, “of the North American Colonies to the mother country, consists in their presenting a field where millions, even of those who are distressed at home, might be established in plenty and happiness. I object only to such emigration as now takes place, without forethought, preparation, method, or system of any kind.”—LORD DURHAM. 1839.

mer at the same time." He also suggests the relief of estates, burthened with a redundant population, by allowing the sum requisite for emigration to be raised on the credit of the poor-rates; and, if we understand him rightly, to be repaid by the particular estate. "The payment," he says, "including interest, would range over a certain number of years; but from the very moment of the emigration, the improvement of agriculture would be rendered possible; there would be therefore an immediate provision for the payment of the instalments. If, on the other hand, you have to support the same people at home, the annual expense will not be much less than the entire expense of emigration." In an after part of his evidence, he tells us, that on the supposition of £5 a-head being the average cost of maintaining a pauper for a year, it would be a most economical application of money to remove him, as the average cost of emigration to Canada is not more than £4 a-head. Mr. De Vere, however, insists on the necessity of such aid from the State as will provide employment for the additional number sent to the colonies, as the colonial labour market would not absorb them. Without emigration, we are told by Mr. De Vere that the Poor-law system in the densely populated districts of Ireland must break down. "It is physically impossible," he says, "that it should continue. The labour and odium attending the management of committees, are such as few can imagine. When the best members have been worked out, the committee will collapse, and the whole relief system break down. Paid guardians may be substituted, but with them the difficulties will be even greater."—We are not sure of this.—"They will have much less local knowledge; and the very fact that they were paid, would make them more subject to popular jealousy and indignation. They would," he adds, "have less facilities in collecting the rates."

It is not in the spirit of a threat that Mr. De Vere states the inevitable result of no sufficient remedial measures being adopted, in an increased immigration of Irish into England, and we almost fancy we hear the war-howl of Tipperary and Limerick—"*Let us arise, and go forth, and eat that nation.*" Such will be their language—metaphor, no doubt—but expressive of a very serious state of facts, which perhaps is too faintly indicated in the scientific dialect in which our witness expresses the determination of his countrymen:—

"The present state of Ireland must necessarily increase the immigration of the Irish poor into England, for the same reason that it has produced it. As long as the wages in England are such as to give the people more than the bare necessities of life, and as long as the Irishman is unable to earn the bare necessities of life by labour in Ireland, it will be worth his while to underbid the English labourer,

and therefore if he chooses to come over to England, I think he is likely to get labour ; at all events, he will try.”*

He will earn his wages—transmit his money home by some bank order, and then claim his transmission back as a pauper at the public expence.

Supposing the present state of the Irish population to continue unaided by emigration, the revenue derived from Ireland must diminish, as all classes who contribute to it will be impoverished. In the year 1847, there was an excess above that of the years 1845 and 1846, but Mr. De Vere accounts for this by the lavish

* Mr. De Vere, in a publication which has reached us since writing the above, and the name of which we have placed at the head of this article, describes in a very lively manner the probable invasion of England by Irish labourers, and its effects :—

“The invading army will be an army of labourers ; a certain proportion of each detachment will find work ; and the rest being sent back free of expence, will try their chance again, and make their way where they find an opening. This invasion is not to be prevented except by violence on the part of the English labourers, which in England must be but local, and therefore unavailing ; for it would not suit a country at once commercial and crowded, to encourage Lynch Law.

“Judge, Sir, what are likely to be the ultimate consequences of this Irish settlement in England, assuming as data your well-known opinions of us. By degrees your favoured land will be as much overpeopled as Ireland. Emigration will become every day more obviously necessary. You will still be talking about it, but you will probably have only succeeded in discovering difficulties which you ought to have overcome. Emigration being still unaided, the question is who the emigrants are to be, Saxon or Celt ? You affirm that the Saxon makes much the better emigrant ; I admit that the Saxon is much the richer man, and all agree that he has more enterprise. The Saxon race therefore will begin to move off ; and in place of the forest giants which you fell, you will make a young “plantation” of your own in New Brunswick, as you did in Ulster. In the meantime, population being thus reduced at home, wages will rise ; and your “Irish enemy” in every parish having waxed prosperous, will think it his duty to marry. The Irish are a people of sanguine temperament, affectionate dispositions, and strong social needs, with a considerable regard for household morality, and only a finite power of calculating consequences ; the aggregate of which qualities points ominously in the direction of holy matrimony. Let no one deceive you : the question with them will very soon be narrowed into this small compass, viz., ‘With whom are they to contract marriage, Saxon or Celt ?’ The Saxon might probably frown upon their suit ; but it is possible that an infinite number of modest young Irish women, with violet eyes, a winning mirth, and a bold innocence, hearing of the prosperity of their brothers, might find their way to England also ; and it might happen that she who was one man’s sister, not standing in that relation to another, would become his wife. What next ? for this is only the beginning of the end. There is not one in a thousand of those young wives, who before the end of one year would not have brought into the world another being exactly like his father, with the exception of being smaller. These are amongst the arts of war ; and it was the young women beyond the Danube and the Caspian that blew up the Roman Empire. What is to stop this process ? In what can it result but the diffusion of one single brogue swallowing up the sixty-four dialects of England ?

“Moreover, Pope Pius IX., whom you were lately on the point of setting down for an enlightened man, has thrown off the mask, and openly declared that he prefers his religion to yours ; nay, that he is a Roman Catholic Puseyite, though a liberal in politics ; in confirmation of which he is constituting in England a hierarchy, built up of bishops, archbishops, and probably a cardinal at the summit. What, if on finding this Church, though in all other respects perfectly appointed, yet deficient in a laity, he should resolve to put up with yours, and issue orders for your conversion accordingly !”

expenditure of money at the time, while the levy of the heavy rates had not yet commenced. A system of emigration, we are told, largely and wisely conducted, would, in addition to its effects on colonial trade and consumption, necessarily increase the revenue and trade of Ireland by increasing its prosperity. It would increase its prosperity by stimulating agriculture, and by improving our social relations, and thus diminishing absenteeism; by adding to the security of property, it would promote the investment of capital. Emigration is necessary as a means of disburthening Ireland from a population, which not only renders impossible the application of any measures for the improvement of that country, but which endangers England, and threatens, in no long period of time, to render the whole empire as miserable as that afflicted country. In the Third Report on Emigration (1826) is a remarkable passage, in which we find this fear distinctly expressed. They recommended—

“The removal of that excess of labour by which the condition of the whole labouring classes is deteriorated and destroyed. The question of emigration from Ireland is decided by the population itself, and that which remains for the Legislature to decide is, whether it shall be turned to the improvement of the British North American colonies, or whether it shall be suffered to take that which will be, and is, its inevitable course—to deluge Great Britain with poverty and wretchedness, and gradually, but certainly, to equalize the state of the English and Irish peasantry. Two different rates of wages, and two different conditions of the labouring classes cannot permanently coexist. One of two results appears to be inevitable; the Irish population must be raised towards the standard of the English, or the English depressed towards that of the Irish.”* The question whether an “extensive plan of emigration shall or shall not be adopted, resolves itself into this simple point—whether the wheat-fed population of Great Britain shall or shall not be supplanted by the potato-fed population of Ireland?—whether Great Britain, in reference to the condition of the lower orders, shall or shall not progressively become what Ireland is?’

* We do not wish to interrupt the statement of this series of authorities, all favourable to colonization, by dwelling on the state of Ireland since the loss of the potato. We therefore prefer stating in a note the following facts and considerations.

In the counties of Limerick and Clare, even antecedent to the failure of the potato crop, the number of labourers was so great that it was impossible for them, during a very considerable portion of the year, to obtain any employment. They lived by taking *conacre*. *Conacre* was land hired for a crop, most often of potatoes, sometimes of oats. No relation of landlord and tenant was intended by the parties to such contracts to exist between them, nor was any such relation implied by the law, which will now and then assert contracts between people, which they have no thought themselves of making. It is not easy to give a precise definition which will include every case coming within the notion of *conacre*, nor will any description be altogether sufficient. An assistant barrister, who gave evidence before the Devon Commission, tells us, that the use of the land for a period within a year is what is meant when the expression is used of *conacre* for the crop. The possession of the land is not supposed to be parted with by the person giving a right to use it for the purpose of growing a crop, nor can he distrain the

This Committee, in 1827, repeated, in other words, the same urgent fear. In 1830, an inquiry into the state of the Irish poor was undertaken by the House of Commons, and the report of the Committee affirmed the same inevitable consequence—suggesting that emigration from Great Britain, then also over-

crop, as for rent. For the right of taking a crop from the land, the peasant will manure the land, and prepare it for a future crop of grain. Such manure is often the sole payment which he makes for the produce of the land which he so occupies. It is often manured for him by the person from whom he takes it, and the payment is then most often in labour. It is impossible to consider all the elements which enter into the calculation when you would estimate the condition of the conacre-holder, but we are scarcely wrong when we say, that in Munster, and where the dealing is between the farmer and the cottier labourer, the value of the land is calculated at the very highest possible price, and the labour at the lowest rate of wages given in the particular district. This statement represents the tenant farmer as more gripping, and the labourer as more oppressed than perhaps the actual facts warrant, as the labour is truly not wanted by the farmer to the extent to which it is necessary that the conacre labourer should give it to discharge his arrear. Neither party to the contract is wholly free. The peasant will combine with his fellow-sufferers of the same class with himself, to turn up grass land, and compel its being given in conacre, if the farmer does not wish to give it, and the low price of labour is the necessary consequence of the number of persons seeking employment, as the political economists would say—wanting food, would be the truer statement, and determined to live in idleness. By the conacre system, the peasant is enabled to procure a certain amount of employment, which he would not otherwise obtain. The value of the return which he gives for it may be estimated from the statement submitted to Lord John Russell by Mr. Godley and others—"In England, only three labourers are employed on every 100 arable acres; in Ireland, eight."* In the Report of the Poor Inquiry Commissioners for Ireland, facts leading to the same conclusion are distinctly stated; and there can be no doubt that though the individual labourer gets less, yet on any given work a greater number of labourers are employed, and a greater sum expended in payment of labour in Ireland than in England. The farmer could, for the most part, get on without these additional hands forced upon him for their own purposes by the cottiers. More of his land than proper management of it would suggest, is thrown into tillage. The circumstances under which work is given by the farmers is illustrated by the examination of a labourer, who held three roods of ground with his cottage, and who found it in general necessary to take an acre of conacre in addition. His family, resident with him at the time of his examination by Lord Devon, were six; his elder sons had been provided for in the police; he is asked, is he able to get employment for any of the six? and his answer is—"No; according as I run in debt, I might get a little employment for them, but I am not just in debt." "In debt to whom?" "To my employer. If I am not able to pay for the conacre, I make application to him, and he will give me some work for an additional man to help me to pay it." He describes eightpence, and sometimes sixpence a day as the wages that can be earned, "and if I left my employment to-morrow, there would be twenty looking for it, bad as it is." The landlord of this man seems to have had the opportunity of giving more employment than farmers usually have, and the tenant seems, from the evidence he gives, to be a hard-working industrious man; but surely, the chance of his getting employment for one of his sons, depending on his being in debt to his employer, shows pretty plainly, that neither are quite free in the dealing, and that which ought to be bought and sold, "a good day's wages for a good day's work," is not the thing contemplated by either buyer or seller. The labourer feels that he is working for a dead horse—to use his own familiar expression—and is disposed to pay for it no higher price than its present value. The conacre system has for the labourer the advantage of getting employment for his wife and children on the ground so occupied. But, whatever be its advantages or disadvantages, with the potato this mode of husbandry seems for ever gone. In

* Memorial of landed proprietors to Lord John Russell, Appendix to Evidence, &c. Colonisation from Ireland, p. 2½.

burthened, if effectual as a remedy, must reproduce the evil; as the rate of wages being increased, would increase the temptation to the immigration of the Irish labourer. Colonization from Ireland, on the contrary, by raising the rate of wages in Ireland, diminishes this inducement, and lessens the number of Irish labourers in the English market. In 1836, a report on the condition of the Irish poor, bearing the signatures of the Archbishop of Dublin, and nine other Commissioners, recommended that while

this system, money did not pass between the labourer and his employer—for the labour was given in payment of a debt already contracted; but, on the other hand, it is a mistake to assert, that money never passed into the conacre tenant's hands. A money value was assumed by both as the measure of what each had to dispose of; in most cases the labour, mortgaged as it were to the farmer, was less than a man's whole time, or less than the price for which the conacre ground was given him, and in these cases necessarily, and in numberless others, the difference was expressed and paid in money secured most frequently by promissory note passed at the time when the ground was given, and payable about the time when the crop was fit to be removed. In every cabin, too, there was a pig, and the pig was always sold for a money price. We are far from sure that any thing would be gained by either of the parties to the contract, if actual money to a greater extent passed between them in this dealing. In every case where potatoes are described as purchased with money by the labourer, it would appear to us, that his labour is sold for a less price. Where the only articles to be exchanged are labour and food, the introduction of money does not facilitate the dealing, while it adds to the expense, by introducing as a new element, the profit of the person whose trade it is to supply money, and whose intervention is only useful when more than two commodities are to be exchanged. When any portion of the capital is supplied either to farmer or labourer by any dealer in money, more than its value is charged for such accommodation, and it seems absolutely incredible to persons, even those best acquainted with Ireland, how the Irish agriculturist—of any class—can pay the sums exacted, when it is necessary at all to deal with borrowed money. Between the farmer and the conacre tenant, we see no use in its introduction to a greater extent than it exists. We believe that in the statement of account between such parties, there is little room for difference, and that, though there is much of grinding oppression, when a disappointment in the crop occurs, and each seeks to shift the loss on the other, in ordinary seasons the advantage is altogether to the labourer. This state of things, however, is one that must pass away when cereal food is introduced—a higher rate of wages must be given. The preparation of this food will introduce the trade of the baker and the miller—and with them money-wages will become necessary—with better food will come the physical power of working more, and the production and preparation of that food, being no longer carried on in the labourer's potato patch and cabin, more labour will be given on his master's ground, and higher wages will have been earned with a fuller measure of profit to his employer. A higher standard of comfort in every thing will be suggested by change of food, and will induce feelings of self-respect, and the population will be proportioned to the level of subsistence—at least such will be the tendency. There can be no doubt whatever, that the reckless marriages in Ireland are chiefly among those who are hopeless of any improvement of their condition—that utter despair and the sympathy it seeks, lead to what in other circumstances would seem to be madness—and that any change in the prospects of the labourer will vary this. Indeed the potato failure of the last year did vary it. Through considerable parts of the country the labourers on the public works were better fed than they had ever been before, but their food was different—they had no longer the conacre potato field; and whether it was that without the bit of ground they feared to marry, or whether other hopes were suggested by the expectation of continued employment at a higher rate of wages, and with better food, there were few marriages among this class during the years of 1846 or 1847.

relief should be given to the impotent poor, the interests of the community, and of the labouring classes in particular, should be guarded, by giving support to the able-bodied only through emigration, or as a preliminary to it. This report was submitted by Government to the consideration of Mr. Lewis and Mr. Senior, and they, too, recommended emigration as absolutely necessary in the circumstances of Ireland. "Emigration can be employed, as in England, in addition to the workhouse; only that which in England is partial, must in Ireland be made general, and that which in England is acted on to a small extent, must in Ireland be acted on to a large extent." They proceed to state the necessity of providing for the emigrants in the colony to which they may be sent. No higher motives are suggested for this than that the fate of the first settlers will determine the success or failure of every extensive system of colonization. "If large numbers of helpless persons are turned out on the coast of America, and left to wander about without guide or protector, many will inevitably fall into difficulties, and these will send home such accounts as will deter other people in Ireland from exposing themselves to the like sufferings." Mr. Senior tells us, that he looks to "emigration as a remedy, not as a regimen; in the present state of Ireland, [he is writing in 1837,] where accidental causes have created an excessive population, it is not only an expedient, but a necessary measure of immediate relief. But I trust," he adds, "that hereafter the population of Ireland will be proportioned to the means of subsistence, not by emigration at the public expense, but by the prudence which keeps it so proportioned in every other part of Europe."

In Mr. Nicholls's reports, on which the Irish poor-law was founded,—and of which poor-law we trust our quoting these reports for a different purpose, will not be understood as implying our approval in any degree whatever,*—the continued migration of

* We cannot but think that when the Irish system of poor-laws was introduced in 1836 that a great mistake was made. There can be no reasonable doubt that the chief object of that measure was to rescue England from the effect of what was described as the continued immigration of Irish pauperism. The existence of the system of English poor-laws had rendered it perhaps necessary, either that the system should be gradually got rid of in England, or adopted in Ireland. The reform of the English poor-laws was a step in the right direction, and we have no doubt that the gradual abolition of the system could have been safely established. That the two countries should permanently exist under different laws on a subject involving the entire social condition of both, would be altogether unjust, and a poor-law for Ireland, or its abolition for England, was inevitable. The immigration of Irish labourers was dwelt on as a grievance to the English labourer. Their permanent introduction would no doubt lower the rate of wages, but their occasional employment in harvest-work could not have this effect. It in truth increased the fund from which wages could be paid, as it enabled more ground to be brought into cultivation than could have been profitably cultivated, had resident labourers whose services were required but for a few weeks been obliged to be supported

labourers from Ireland to England is dwelt upon as a grievance to England; and Mr. Nicholls says, that to remedy this, "emigration . not only may, but I believe, must, be had recourse to whenever the population becomes excessive in any district." He would limit the emigration to British colonies, and have arrangements made to protect the emigrants on their arrival, and to ensure their employment at the earliest period. "At home," he adds, "they were a burthen: in their new position they will increase the general productive powers of the empire, as well as enlarge

from the farm on which a few weeks' work was required for the whole year. During the last year, when what was called labour on the public roads kept the Irishman at home, much of the harvest in England is said to have been lost. This view of the question is very strikingly put by Mr. Senior, in a pamphlet published in 1831, and, after discussing the question of labourers in great towns, where the immigrants resort, he says, "I have argued the question as an Englishman, but as an inhabitant of the British Empire, bound to look impartially at the interests of its different members, I am inexpressibly disgusted at the wish to deprive the Irish labourer of his resort to England. No one can doubt the benefits derived by Ireland from that intercourse, not merely among those of the Irish that come here, but even among those that remain at home. The *Evidence* (State of Ireland, 1830) is full of the improvement in habits, tastes, and feelings, introduced into Ireland by those who have visited England. And is it politic, is it just, to wish to deprive Ireland, as much a part of the Empire as England, of these advantages, merely on the ground of some supposed inconvenience to ourselves? Can the Union have more effective enemies than those who would consider Great Britain and Ireland as *one* country when we are to gain by it, and *two* when we fancy we are to lose?" This would not be the time or place to state our views on the subject, but we may say that we agree with Dr. Chalmers' reasoning, in which—without however relying on emigration as of all the advantage to the parent country, which it appears to us to possess—he insists on it as of the utmost importance, as a temporary expedient, to assist England—and, we may now add, the other parts of the empire—in retracing its steps, and enabling it to get rid of its poor-law system. Mr. Senior, who quotes in the pamphlet we have just cited, a considerable portion of Dr. Chalmers' *Evidence*, ("Poor of Ireland, 1830,") describes that *Evidence* as "the most instructive, perhaps, ever given before a Committee of the House of Commons. Its publication in a cheaper form, instead of being locked up in the folios of the Report, would be a great public service." Even now, at the distance of nearly twenty years since it was given, we wish it could be reprinted. His answer to a very important and searching question deserves to be often in the Statesman's mind who thinks of the two great portions of the Empire,—"*Is not the tendency of the system of the poor-laws to produce pauperism, and the tendency of a system of charitable relief to produce mendicancy?*" His reply is, "I think that it depends altogether on the state of the population as to character and morals. It is a most important question for Ireland, whether you will submit for a time to its mendicity, or exchange that mendicity for a regular and compulsory pauperism. Now, on many accounts, I would prefer the former alternative, and one of my reasons is, that education will at length quell the one, but not the other. The act of becoming a mendicant is one of unmixed degradation; and the self respect, inspired by education, stands directly and diametrically opposed to it. It is not so with the act of becoming a pauper, a state sanctioned by law, and in entering on which the consciousness of right, and the resolute assertion of it, temper the humiliation. This admits of historical illustration. The mendicity of Scotland gave way, in a few years, to its education. The pauperism and education of England advanced contemporaneously. The floating mendicity of Ireland will cease under the causes which may be brought to bear on it. Establish pauperism, you will establish so many parochial fixtures around which your worst population will gather, and from which you will find it impossible to dislodge them."

the demand for British produce." In his second report, he again adverts to the effect of an excess of labour beyond the existing means of employment, and its inevitable result in depressing the whole population in the moral and social scale. "The evil is pressing, and emigration seems to be the only immediate remedy, or rather palliation, for the state of things existing in Donegal, and in other parts of the west and south." In Lord Devon's report, emigration was in the same way insisted on, not as a single remedy, but as one of many. In Lord John Russell's speech in 1837, on introducing the Irish poor-law, there was almost a pledge given of its being accompanied with measures for an extensive emigration. He spoke of the measure as quite ineffective to save the people from destitution, and the necessity there was to have "some vent in emigration, in order to relieve the country during a state of transition."*

The opinions thus expressed were all formed long before the potato rot had rendered the question, if possible, more free from doubt; and individual landlords have, to the great advantage of their people, both those whom they assisted to remove, and those whom they retained, done much to aid emigration; tenants, too, more enterprising than honest, have in numberless instances decamped with as many years' rent as they could in their pocket, and often with money given them as the price of the holding, of the produce of which the landlord had been defrauded,—for the practical assertion of what is called tenant right in the dialect of the tribunes of the people, is exhibited in the introduction of some new occupant, without the consent or the knowledge of the landlord. The popular theory of tenant right assumes that a landlord is at all times anxious to get rid of a thriving, industrious tenant, and that against these aggressions a protection beyond what any contract between the parties gives, should be regarded as impliedly contained in it—in short, that dealing with a man for a year or two, should be tantamount to giving him rights of unlimited possession, or—as each year some new enactment abridges the landlord's rights, and remedies—we may say, absolute ownership. In many of the Irish estates the landlord is only known by his having cast on him—from any other resources he may be able to command—the support of a famished people. No property, however large, can be sufficient for indefinite demands; and in the evidence collected by this Committee, we are glad to see the benevolence of many of these maligned landlords limited

* And see a passage to the same effect, from a speech of Lord Grey, 22d February, 1831:—"Before any measure could be adopted for the permanent relief of the poor in Ireland, it would be absolutely necessary to relieve the country of its superabundant population."

only by the amount of their whole means. Mr. De Vere tells us of even two hundred persons emigrating from the electoral division in which he lives, many of them finding, from their own resources, the means of removal; many assisted by his brother, Sir Vere de Vere; some, too, making out the means of travel by crowns and half-crowns scraped up among acquaintances. Debts of the kind, Mr. De Vere tells us, he has known faithfully repaid. A loan thus given, it would appear, is regarded in a different light from rent, which, from whatever cause, does not appear to affect the conscience as a debt in Ireland, whenever it can on any pretence be withheld. Mr. Kincaid, an eminent land agent, one of a firm which has agencies in most parts of Ireland, tells us, that no covenants in leases, no acts of the parties or of the legislature, have been able to prevent subletting and subdivision of farms. Two or three families will crowd under one roof, and what was originally an out-office will be turned into a dwelling for a separate family, and the fact concealed from the landlord and his agent. The electoral division of Clifony is valued at £2300, the number of people is 6000. A rate has been there struck, of six and eightpence to the pound, for three months—plain evidence this, if the valuation bear any reasonable proportion to the actual value, that the district cannot support the people upon it. From this estate, and another in the county of Sligo, Lord Palmerston, through Mr. Kincaid, sent out to Quebec, at a cost of £3000, 894 individuals, or 136 families. We have not space to state Mr. Kincaid's arrangements with reference to the land of these people, thus got into his possession. It had been before held in the sort of undivided partnership, into which the idea of property no doubt enters, but which seems to guard against any individual ever exercising any of the rights connected therewith, except in conjunction with all the villagers of the district. Mr. Kincaid did wonders. He formed parallelograms—he ditched and he drained—he gave each tenant his own land divided from others—he brought an agriculturalist, who told of the proper cultivation of the soil, and the growth of green crops. The farms divided as we have said, were distributed among the members of the old tenant partnership by lot. Some would not draw, and some disliked the lots they had drawn. There was discontent enough with the arrangements for a while, but the people seeing the agent to be in earnest, yielded. The same kind of proceedings, on other estates, were not attended with the same result. Some other agents had less taste in parallelograms than our great engineer. In Donegal, where similar proceedings took place, the strips were so narrow, that a man had scarcely room to build a house on one, and it extended up a mountain at great length. Mr. Kincaid's parallelograms

were wider, and shorter, and "tidier," every way. There can be no doubt that, for horse labour and for shelter, and other details of agriculture, the proper division of farms into fields with right angles, gives a very serious advantage; yet we suspect that an agent may, every now and then, be too much of a martinet, and the line which winds round the corn-field and the garden, "honouring the sacred bounds of property," is not without its occasional fitness as well as grace. Among these people, however, whether removed or retained, Mr. Kincaid's mission was one not of unmixed good—for what human exertion, however successful, can be this—though of unmixed benevolence. Of rent none whatever was collected, nor does it seem to have been asked. To collect the poor-rate we have mentioned would itself seem to be impossible. Emigration was, in the circumstances, not only the wisest course for the proprietor, but also for the people: and they too thought so, for on part of the land more solicited to be sent away than it was Mr. Kincaid's purpose to remove. The land if given up in fee to the occupants, would not have supported them permanently. Emigration was necessary, but never were there cases which more clearly prove that, to be of the use it ought to the emigrant, emigration should not be left unaided by the State. In Roscommon Mr. Kincaid removed 140 or 150 families, paying them from £3 to £5 a family; some went to America—adding, to what they received from their landlords, means of their own—the great majority to England or Scotland. The emigrants from Lord Palmerston's Sligo estates, were sent to Quebec, their passage thither being merely paid. In Longford about 220 were removed this year by the same agent; Mr. Kincaid's course was to proceed by ejectment—thus obtaining entire dominion of the lands, and then the tenants came to some terms with him. When asked, whether the tenants, thus removed, may not seek to return and repossess themselves of their houses? he answers, "I have thrown the houses down—if any considerable number come back they will scarcely know their own land again." He tells the Committee that he has with his own hands thrown down houses in the course of building, when such buildings were contrary to the covenants of a lease; and in reply to some doubt expressed by a member of the Committee, as to the legality of the act—he replies, "I am not certain about the liability to legal proceedings that I may incur; but I did it at some personal risk, of course. I should mention that, if a person looks at the consequences, legal or personal, of every step he takes in the management of property in Ireland, he will do nothing. A person must do his duty properly, and go boldly forward, and not appear to be afraid of consequences." The plan of sending families to England had not been practised by Mr. Kincaid till

this year; and considering that the object of the poor law introduced into Ireland, was the relief of England from the introduction of the Irish destitute poor, we are scarce surprised at the struggle between the two countries, to shift from one to the other the burden of destitution. Mr. Kincaid is asked, will not England send them back? and he replies, "no doubt—but they will be sent back not to Roscommon, but to Dublin." His estate is rid of them, and it is no matter to him, how or where they are provided for. With reference to Lord Palmerston's tenants who were sent to America, all that Mr. Kincaid did, was providing them a passage to Quebec, and food on the voyage. "Beyond that, all that I did was to suggest to Lord Palmerston the propriety of getting a letter written to Mr. Buchanan, the emigration agent in Quebec, to give as much attention to them as possible, in order to get them employment on their arrival at the other side. *There have been no letters from the emigrants yet.*" This was in June—what letters have been since received we know not, but of some of the voyagers the *Montreal Herald* gives the following account:—

"On the 30th of October last, the Lord Ashburton arrived at Grosse Isle, with a cargo of 475 emigrants, of whom no less than 107 had died on the voyage. Sixty more were sick; and on board the steamer to which the passengers were transferred, five deaths occurred between the quarantine ground and Quebec. Many of the passengers by this vessel have since arrived in Montreal, and have the most wretched appearance. The vessel was from the west of Ireland, and a large portion of the passengers are said to be from Lord Palmerston's estates. What they are to do here this winter it is impossible to say: there seems to be no other resource for them than public charity. Had it not been that the present season is unusually mild, there is great reason to believe that few of them would have escaped death from the cold in the Gulf. Up to this time, however, the weather has continued fine and open; and they have escaped one danger, only to fall, in too many instances, by the stroke of fever. Yesterday, the 10th of November, another emigrant ship reached Quebec, from Sligo. The mortality has been that of an army: on the passage, 3900; at Grosse Isle, 3452; in ships at quarantine, 1282; at the Marine Hospital, Quebec, 1000; making 9634; and this fearful account does not include the deaths at the sheds and hospital in Montreal, Kingston, Toronto, Bytown, and Hamilton, or those which have occurred unnoticed and unknown, by the way-side, and in the small taverns of the country parts. In Montreal the average number of sick in the hospital during the week ending November 6, has been 702, and the deaths sixty-six. The expenses defrayed out of the provincial chest for this object must be enormous. We have heard them calculated at no less than a quarter of a million, but this is probably an exaggeration, and there will still be a

huge charge for the imperial government to boot. Money is still not the worst loss; the destruction of valuable lives is esteemed a far greater calamity."

In the *St. John's Courier* of New Brunswick, of the 13th of November, we find an official account of the arrival of the *Æolus*. The health officer of St. John's, who inspected the ship, reports that among the passengers are—

"many superannuated people, and others of broken-down constitutions, and subjects of chronic disease, lame, widows with very large helpless families, feeble men (through chronic diseases, &c.), with large, helpless families. In fact, all those causes which rendered them paupers upon the hands of their landlords are now in existence with added force, from recent disease, &c., to fasten them upon us. And when nearly 400, so glaringly paupers, are thus sent out—who so tame as would not feel indignant at the outrage?"* At the meeting of Common Council, to which this report was presented, it was resolved that 'as all public buildings erected for almshouse purposes are already filled to overflowing with Irish emigrants,' no means of arresting the evil presented themselves, 'except by inducing a large portion of those lately arrived in the *Æolus*, and others begging from door to door, to return to their native country;' and to this end it was determined to offer a free passage, with provisions and water, to all who will accept them, and to request the clergy 'to use their influence in inducing these distressed people to accept a passage to Ireland upon the terms proposed.'"

If Mr. Kincaid's evidence goes far to prove the necessity of emigration, do not these extracts from American documents pretty clearly show, that it ought not to be left to the guidance of the poor emigrants themselves, or even to their landlords, however benevolent? Indeed, the great difficulty of the case has always seemed to us to be that, for Ireland, the removal of families seems to be the thing necessary—for the colonies the introduction not of whole families, but of the young, whether parents or children. That families—whole families, are often re-united in Canada or Australia, we well know, but this is not by the distinct efforts of landlords, removing the helpless as well as the strong, and considering only the convenience of the estate from which the removal takes place, but from the successful exertions of the young people who emigrate, and who do what they can to induce their parents, and brothers, and sisters to follow. This has been proved before the Committee by several witnesses,

* This letter, which we print from the "*St. John's Courier*," has been since published in the official correspondence (just issued) between Sir W. Colebrooke and Earl Grey. Papers relative to Emigration, presented Dec. 20, 1847. P. 155.

and several letters from Mr. Harvey have been published in the newspapers, familiarizing the public with the fact; but nowhere is it more touchingly exhibited than in a published letter from Mr. Murray to Sir Robert Peel, entitled, "Ireland—its present condition and future prospects."* Mr. Murray is at the head of a great establishment—the Provincial Bank of Ireland—and he tells us, that in a period of less than a year, 24,000 small money orders, ranging from £1 to £10, amounting in all to £125,000, or, on an average, to £5, 4s. 2d. each, were sent by emigrants in America to their Irish relatives. These remittances were in part occasioned by the distress, and intended for its relief; in part were remittances to enable relatives to follow the emigrant. "They are sent," says Mr. Murray, "from husband to wife, from father to child, from child to father, mother, and grandparents, from sister to brother, and the reverse; and from and to those united by all the ties of blood and friendship that bind us together on earth." In Mr. Perley's evidence respecting New Brunswick, the fact is dwelt on of few emigrants coming who "are not inquired for" at the emigration offices. "Emigration," he says, "begets emigration."

Of the evidence given before the Committee, that of Mr. Elliot, the chairman of the Colonial Land and Emigration Board, is perhaps the most interesting. He gives a minute account of the progress of emigration to our different colonies since the period of Mr. Wilmot Horton's Committee in 1826. A few years previous to that, and in connexion with Irish distresses, two experiments of emigration—both to Upper Canada—under Mr. Peter Robinson, took place in 1823 and 1825. In 1823, 568 persons, including some women and children, were taken out at a cost of £22 a-head, including the settlement of the people. In 1825, the emigration consisted of 2024 persons, at £21, 6s. per head. The result of the experiment, in both cases, is described by Mr. Robinson as beneficial for the emigrants, but too costly to be repeated. The stock in the possession of the emigrants of 1823, in 1826 was valued at £7662, 6s. 6d. sterling. In 1826 and 1827, a vast deal of information was brought together by Mr. W. Horton's committees. The Committee of 1827 recommended that emigration should be carried on by the means of loans, to be repaid by the emigrant. This probably seemed a very doubtful security, for the proposal was never acted on. The best and most important step in the history of English colonization, was Lord Ripon's instructions abolishing the practice of free grants of land, and directing that land should never, in any of the Bri-

* Dublin: M'Glashan, 1847.

tish colonies, be disposed of otherwise than by sale. In this, he was acting on the views of Mr. Wakefield, by far the most intelligent writer who has ever examined the subject of colonization. Wakefield had urged the necessity of labour in combination as an essential element in rendering waste land profitable. To the want of being able to combine labour, and to the disposition of each settler to live apart, he traced the failure of the early English settlements in America. Land without labourers to cultivate it, is a useless and a pernicious gift; and his theory was, that having ascertained the number of men it would take to cultivate an acre of land, and the cost at which they could be brought to the spot where their labour was required, you had the means of determining the price at which Government ought to sell colonial land. The price obtained for it was, according to his plan, to be exclusively employed in bringing out labourers. It is not often that a project is at once listened to by parties in power, but in this case, within a year of his proposition being brought before the public, it was to some extent acted on; not but that, like most men's hopes and wishes, one-half was blown away into empty air. The land was sold—not given away; but the produce was not exclusively applied in the importation of labour. It was sold, too, in many of the colonies, at a ruinously high price, and having no reference whatever to the principle which Wakefield said ought to determine its cost. This would have been more vexatious, if the projector had not himself departed from his principle by fixing the same price on all land;* and yet, more unfortunately, the price fixed on the land in South Australia, where his views were carried into more distinct practice than elsewhere, was estimated by calculations connected with the labour necessary for tillage, which suggested a pound an acre, whereas the country is valuable chiefly for pasturage, which requires such tracts of land for any profitable employment of capital, that twopence an acre, we are told by Mr. Archibald Cunningham, is more than its value. In 1831, by the application of funds derived from the sale of lands, emigration to Australia was commenced. We pass over rapidly the detail of arrangements made to provide for the health and comfort of the emigrants, and the immediate consequences of those arrangements in the diminution of disease and mortality in the voyage. The effect of an emigration fund, by which labour could be at once brought into a colony, was never more manifested than in the early prosperity of Port Phillip. Sir Richard Bourke, the governor of New South Wales, made his first visit to Melbourne in 1837, and found about eighty families living

* See Merivale on Colonization, vol. ii. pp. 52-59.

there. In 1836, the revenue of Port Phillip was nothing. Its imports and exports were returned *nil*. In 1845, its revenue was £89,118; its imports £205,390; and its exports £342,624; the population estimated in 1836, at 200 or 300 persons, was by the census of March 1846, 32,879. On the 1st of January 1845, the number of houses in Melbourne was 2389, and their assessed value £47,343 per annum. On the 1st of January 1846, the sheep were 2,449,527, and horned cattle 231,602. In 1832, the whole of the Australian settlements did not produce more than about three and a half million pounds of wool; in the season of 1845-6, Port Phillip exported seven and a half million pounds. The approaching wool-clip in Port Phillip, (this evidence was given June 1847,) is estimated at ten million pounds, more than the whole world sent into Great Britain in 1820.* The prosperity of Port Phillip was no doubt increased by the vicinity of the previously settled colonies. Many of its first occupants came from Van Dieman's Land; the flocks and herds, too, with many proprietors, came from New South Wales. Still the great bulk of its population have been brought from England within the last ten years. "Its present population may be said to represent all classes of the parent country—from the educated to the labouring"—we suppose this language is chosen for the purpose of intimating that, of the highest classes there are no representatives in colonial society—"because," Mr. Elliot adds, "the capitalists who first went into Port Phillip would naturally bring their servants with them; and while many men of capital were tempted from England by the rapid increase of wealth, numbers of labouring emigrants were sent out by the land fund." Port Phillip now contains, among its inhabitants, many persons who have been educated at the Universities. The command of labour supplied to them by the application of the land fund, has been the chief inducement to settle. Had not labour been thus supplied, wages would have been so high as to render it not worth while for capitalists to settle. In the history of man, there has been nothing like the rapid prosperity of Port Phillip, and it should not be forgotten that in this prosperity the mother country is a sharer, for incidental to its progress is a demand for British manufactured goods, which would not have taken place had these settlers remained in Great Britain. Mr. Elliot gives an account of the prosperity of South Australia since 1840, at which period its true history may be said to begin. Over-speculation,

* In Colonel M'Arthur's evidence, (*Colonization from Ireland*, p. 313,) "From one bale of wool in 1806, of less weight than 300 lbs., the produce was increased (in 1846) in Australasia to 21,789,000 lbs. of the net value of £1,089,000 sterling."

and a reliance on what was called the self-supporting system, made the first four years of its history rather that of a gambling transaction than of any thing else with which it can be compared. The expenses of an infant colony, which, in all cases, must be at the loss of the mother country, or the first founders of the colony, were sought to be provided for by mortgaging the anticipated colonial revenue, and this, as might be easily foreseen, ended in the mother country having to interfere and pay for those absolutely necessary expenses from its own means. The bankruptcy of the colony—the interposition of England to lessen individual suffering, and the throwing the colony for its future support on its own resources, has made its subsequent progress one of great prosperity; the population which in 1840 was 14,610, was in 1845, 22,390. In 1840, the number of acres in cultivation was 2503; in 1845, was 26,218. In 1840, the exports of colonial produce were £15,650; in 1845, were £131,800; and what to us appears a stronger proof of the prosperity of the colony resting on a true basis, the expenditure which was in 1840, £169,966, was in 1845 reduced to £36,182. The prosperity is not in any degree to be ascribed to the discovery of the copper mines, as copper ore did not till 1846 form any large proportion of the exports. The expenditure of roads, buildings, &c., the necessary outfit of a colony, ought from the first to have been regarded as an expense that could not have been borne by the colony, and the effort to persuade speculators in Australian land that it could bear all these public expenses, led to the evil. The effort, too, to tempt in capital at any hazard, could not easily have had any other result than that which led to the crisis of 1839, since which all has gone on well. Perhaps the purely economic view of these matters is too exclusively regarded now, and that in founding colonies we forget all that relates to man's better nature. That room for more free growth might be obtained for all man's better faculties, was the motive with which many of the earlier American states were first founded, and interruptedly and imperfectly as this hope worked itself out, yet it has on the whole been realized in many of the American institutions. The virtues of the English Commonwealth found a refuge there, and what would been else regarded as a mere dream of political visionaries, is expressed in outward manifestation and life. We do not say that we agree with these founders of empire in the wilderness, in their views of either church or state, but we can sympathise with the devotedness and self-sacrifice with which they perilled all, but conscience.

“What should we do but sing His praise
That led us through the watery maze,

Unto an Isle so long unknown,
And yet much kinder than our own ?

"He lands us on this grassy stage,
Safe from the storm's and prelate's rage ;
He gives us this eternal spring,
Which here enamels every thing.

"He hangs in shades the orange bright,
Like golden lamps in a green night,
And, in these rocks, for us did frame
A temple where to sound His name."

Thus sung they in the English boat,
A holy and a cheerful note ;
And all the way to guide their chime,
With falling oars they kept the time.*

We remember what Bacon has said, and it seems to us almost in contrast with the demands of instant profit—returns of capital—amount of wages—and all the language of modern science appealing for ever to partial truths, and truths of a kind that man is little likely to forget. Let not such truths be disregarded ; but let not men be addressed, as if they alone were true. "Let men," says Bacon, "make that profit of being in the wilderness, as they have God always and His service before their eyes : let not the government of the plantation depend upon too many counsellors and undertakers in the country that planteth, but upon a temperate number ; and let these be rather noblemen and gentlemen than merchants, for *they* look ever to the present gain."† The feeling, in which this passage is written, should rather be thought of than the letter, for our merchants now are, of all classes of society, those who have the most generous and princely spirit ; but the miserable hope of immediate profit has been the cause of all the evil of the first four years of South Australia. Western Australia was, from other causes, an absolute failure. Land had been given in vast quantities to individuals. One gentleman received 500,000 acres ; another 100,000. These lavish grants of land dispersed the settlers ; and where everybody could obtain land, none would consent to labour. Men of the highest station

* Andrew Marvell.

† "Let there," he adds, "be freedom from custom till the plantations be of strength, and not only freedom from custom, but freedom to carry their commodities where they can make the best use of them, except there be some special cause of caution. * * If you plant where savages are, do not entertain them with trifles and gingles, but use them justly and graciously, with sufficient guard, nevertheless. * * Send some of them over to the country that plants, that they may see a better condition than their own, and commend it when they return. It is the sinfulness thing in the world to forsake or destitute a plantation once in forwardness ; for besides the dishonour, it is the guiltiness of blood of many commiserable persons."—BACON. *Of Plantations*.

had themselves to perform menial offices. There is no land fund, by the application of which labour may be brought to Western Australia. The same system as to the sale of land exists there as elsewhere; but so much land is in private hands, that the system has no room to work. Of New Zealand, Mr. Elliot is not able to give the Committee any very perfect information. The latest official accounts are favourable to the prospects of the colony, and its disasters and reverses are as nothing compared with the sufferings of the old settlements. Mr. Elliot seems impatient at the reproach, so often hastily made, that in modern times the art of colonization has been lost; and he compares the prosperity of our colonies of late years, with the calamities of war and famine which were suffered in the days of Raleigh and Smith. "When next the decay of colonization is spoken of, I trust it will be remembered, that, besides 750,000 emigrants to other places in the last ten years, three new colonies have been founded, and 70,000 British subjects are living in them in prosperity unexampled in the earlier settlements." In illustration of his view of the progress of the lately formed colonies, as compared with the earlier British settlements, he gives us some facts worth remembering. Sydney (in New South Wales,) in 1836, contained rather more than 19,000 inhabitants; in 1846, it contained 38,000. It had doubled in ten years. In 1790, seven years after the Revolution, and about 170 years after its foundation, Boston contained 18,038 inhabitants, less than half the number that Sydney contained after but seventy years. He adds similar facts of New York and Philadelphia. This could not be ascribed to the importation of convicts, for in 1836, the bond population formed 18 per cent. of the population; in 1846, only two per cent. A purchaser of Australian land is entitled to propose to the Commissioners a number of labourers, in proportion to the sum he has paid, to be taken out; for every one hundred pounds, five labourers are taken out. He thus gets back in emigration the money he has paid for land. Mr. Elliot informs the Committee, and the details given by the agents to whose management the emigration is committed, illustrate what he says, that the Australian emigration, from being systematic, is far more successful than the emigration to America. The cry of want of labour from the colonists is to be listened to with some distrust, as it is certainly possible to overdo the business. Labourers, both in New South Wales and Australia, were for months supported at the public expense, within the last five years. In South Australia, the expenditure in 1842, was at the rate of £25,000 a-year. Mr. Elliot tells us, without, however, quite satisfying us how he arrives at the conclusion, that it would not be possible to pour into Australia, with

safety, one-tenth part of the population who are going annually to North America. He gives an account of what was called the "bounty system," under which emigrants were formerly conveyed to the colonies:—a settler wishing to introduce labourers was supposed to be doing good service to the community, and was paid by public money the expense of their conveyance. The orders entitling him to import labourers on this condition, were called "bounty orders." The orders at first were almost always executed by one person, and were admirably executed; after a time, they fell into the hands of several shipowners. The management of shipping affairs and the selection of emigrants, are very different things; and respectable merchants failed in bringing the emigrants to their destination in good health. The system is abandoned, or acted on with such modifications now, as to be no longer the same; and if we understand Mr. Elliot rightly, is now only acted on in a small emigration going on to the Cape of Good Hope. In none of the settled colonies can any large sum be expected to arise from the sale of lands. The best lands in all are already sold. In South Australia, Government received from the sale of land, in a few years, nearly £300,000. In Port Phillip, within the last ten years, upwards of £400,000. The New Zealand Company have got from land sales, £300,000. Of such sums there seems to be no chance at any future time; but there are lands in abundance, on which, though money cannot be obtained by their sale, humble settlers may be placed and find a home. This is true with respect both to Australia and British America.

Important evidence on the subject of Australia, is given by Colonel McArthur, whose family were among the earliest settlers at Sydney, and are now possessed of one of the most considerable landed properties in New South Wales. He has himself lived in the colony, many years ago however, but has since visited it, and been conversant with its affairs. The supply of labour is now wholly insufficient he tells us. The defect of labour is, he says, a social and a political evil;—a social evil, because it creates a competition among employers for the services of labourers; and a political evil, because such a state of things tends to promote a democracy. We do not quite see this—but no matter—the Colonel, whether aristocrat or democrat, or neither, is a most intelligent and instructive witness. We have before mentioned from his evidence the increase of the wool exports from Australia. His father was the first who introduced the cultivation of this branch of industry, through which mainly "the colony commands its share of the comforts of European life," or in fact subsists at all, and his family are now engaged, with every prospect of success, in introducing the

culture of the vine. His brothers have a vineyard about forty miles from Sydney, which was first cultivated by some Greek pirates who were sent out as convicts. After a time they returned to their own country, and Colonel M'Arthur induced some German families to come to New South Wales to attend to the vineyard operations. They brought with them many thousand vine cuttings from Hattenheim on the Rhine. The vineyard has extended to twenty-eight acres. The wine meets with ready sale in the colony, but a duty of 5s. 6d. a gallon prevents its being introduced into England. Olive oil will soon be among the exports of Australia. For the introduction of this, too, we are indebted to the same enterprising family. The Australian horse, too, is becoming a favourite. The climate seems equal to that of Arabia itself for the horse, and Colonel M'Arthur's father frequently presented horses to officers going with their regiments to India, that the qualities of the Australian horse might be known there. They are now sent annually to Calcutta, and the best horses produce about £60 or £70, after the payment of the passage and other expenses. Silk, we are told, would before now have become an exportable commodity from Australia, if the experience of foreigners could have been obtained to direct its management. In every thing in Australia, we are told that the want of an adequate supply of labour produces exceeding loss. With respect to wool, one-third more wool would, with an adequate number of persons to attend the flocks, be produced, and the wool would be of a better quality. The carcases of the sheep are now often boiled down for tallow, for want of an adequate supply of shepherds. For want of labourers agriculture is not introduced. When the fund arising from the sale of lands was expended in emigration, during the first two years of the system, 51,736 persons of the humbler classes were conveyed to Sydney and Port Phillip, and about 34,000 persons, whose passage was defrayed by themselves, arrived during the same interval. While Colonel M'Arthur entertains no doubt of the great advantage of introducing labourers into all the Australian colonies, he does not assent to the view that it is necessary to have these labourers accompanied by emigrants of a higher class. Introduce labour, he says, and the other classes will follow. The question is repeated in some half-dozen forms, but his answer is still the same. He is asked, "suppose the emigration of the privates of a regiment, would it offer as reasonable a chance of success as if they emigrated, accompanied by their officers, who might be held to represent the higher classes in life?" and he answers, "as regards mere colonization, I certainly think it would not; there is a wide distinction to be taken between soldiers and colonists—the one being under discipline which they cannot shake

off, and the other under a discipline which cannot be maintained." We agree with Colonel M'Arthur, when the inquiry is with respect to the introduction of labourers into a settled country. It is a different thing, however, when a new colony is to be founded; and, till we see the further reports of the Committee, we must assume that the question was asked rather with some such reference than with respect to Sydney or Port Phillip. Colonel M'Arthur thinks that the people of Connaught would make excellent shepherds and herdsmen. The Irish are good agricultural servants—but the Colonel is averse, and we think wisely, to their being kept together as a separate class. He would have them intermingled with the general population. Colonel M'Arthur dwells on two circumstances likely to be lost sight of in other considerations, and which are calculated to affect the public mind when distinctly presented:—the money spent in promoting emigration is all spent in the mother country; and of the colonial revenue, one-eighth, it would appear, is appropriated to purposes of religion and education. Colonel M'Arthur was in Ireland about two years since, and found the people in Leitrim delighted at the notion of a free passage to Australia being given to labourers. They said with one voice, "if that were done, it would relieve us from the many evils of our position; but we fear such days are not in store for poor old Ireland."

Our limits—and we exceedingly regret it—render it impossible that we should give much more of the evidence relating to Australia, but we cannot forbear directing attention to that of Mrs. Caroline Chisholm, to whom the emigrants, and the colony, and the parent country, owe a deep debt of gratitude. When emigrants were introduced under "the bounty system," her attention was called to the unprotected state in which single females found themselves at landing—and her efforts were directed to procuring them situations;—afterwards she sought to perform the same services for families and for single men. Her first step was to get possession of a Government building, which she called the "Female Emigrant's Home." The public supported her by subscriptions, and she formed committees and established agencies in the interior of the country, ascertaining where servants were required, and supplying them from the young females who found a shelter in the establishment she had erected. She then established country "homes," or depôts, herself occasionally travelling with the girls for whom she wished to provide: the majority were Irish. She paid their travelling expenses, which, however, were afterwards refunded; the inhabitants of the districts through which they passed supplied them with food. The importance of the step she adopted

is shown by the fact that there was an excess of labour in Sydney at the very time she succeeded in obtaining good wages for those she took up the country, and many of the same class of emigrants were at Sydney supported at the expense of Government. In providing for families, she often undertook journeys of three hundred miles; the farther she went the more satisfactory was the settlement—the men receiving £18 to £30 a-year, with double rations. From the Government she received, in one way or other, about £100. Exceeding liberality was shown by individuals, who offered her money, but she had not occasion to draw on their support; in the good work in which she engaged she was sustained by the people of the country through which she passed. At public inns the females were sheltered, and she herself provisioned without any charge. "My personal expenses at inns during my seven years' service, amounted only to £1, 18s. 6d." Her pecuniary difficulties and anxieties, however, were very great. Absence from home made the expenditure of her domestic establishment much greater than when things were regulated under her own superintendence; she had also to pay an army of clerks. Employers of labour were often afraid to advance the money necessary for the conveyance of the servants they wanted, lest, their passage being paid, the emigrants should never make their appearance. This difficulty was met by Mrs. Chisholm paying the transit money, confiding in the good feeling of the servant that he would keep his engagement, and of the principle of the master that he would repay her. In hundreds of cases the masters were strangers to her, and yet she lost but £16 by casualties. Some nights she paid as much as £40 for steamers and land conveyance. She has been the means of settling with families, from first to last, about eleven thousand souls. The wages in general she got for female servants were from £9 to £16 a-year—they were also boarded and lodged as members of the family. Most of these girls got married, and often into the families of the farmers with whom they served. When Mrs. Chisholm succeeded in getting one servant placed in a district, it immediately led to the other farmers seeking the same assistance in their household. She acted systematically on this principle. It was first suggested by the accident of her having succeeded in persuading a man to take a servant, who resisted, saying, it would make a fine lady of his wife. "I told him the years his wife had been labouring for him, and this had the desired effect." The following morning a neighbouring settler called on her,—“You are quite upsetting the settlement, Mrs. Chisholm; my wife is uncommonly cross this morning; she says she is as good as her neighbour, and must have a servant too.” Among this class the girls eventually married. If they married

one of the sons, the father and mother were thankful; if not, they were protected as members of the family; they slept in the same room with their own daughters. Mrs. Chisholm had a thousand direct applications for wives, but she had no taste or talent for match-making; this was soon done by the parties themselves. Her mission was one of six years—six years' hard work she called it, but it was its own great reward. Girls that she had first found in a state of such entire destitution that she had to supply them with clothes, have come to her looking for servants, and with every comfort about them. They entreat of her to assist in getting their friends and relations to follow them. Girls from the country are in all cases surer of obtaining a settlement in marriage than smart town servants. If 600 girls were sent to Sydney—smart London house-servants—they would at once get good wages at Sydney, but would not have the same chance of marriage. Well conducted, healthy girls, that can milk cows and attend to the light work about a farm-house and garden, are the best suited to the kind of settlement Mrs. Chisholm describes; girls who have not been in service before, but who have worked for their father's family. Servants are accustomed to the comforts of a regular establishment, and would not do for the bush. "There is a good demand also for superior servants in the interior, but the great demand is the matrimonial demand;" and though no match-maker, this is what Mrs. Chisholm chiefly considers, and to this she has devoted herself. The Irishmen prefer Irish girls. Several of the Irishmen there have formerly got into what is called a little bit of trouble, and they think their countrywomen will understand them best. She mentions the good conduct and prosperity of persons in the colony who have been transported for political offences, and says there are hundreds of such instances. She describes the number of emigrants that the colony would absorb as being almost unlimited, but every thing depends on antecedent preparation. An agent, acquainted with the wants of the colony, and with the localities in which labour is required, would be absolutely necessary. Land should be surveyed and divided into farms, varying from thirty to an hundred acres, and put up to sale in these small divisions. These would be bought by labourers who have saved money, who are anxious to farm on their own account, and who have now no opportunity of purchasing land in such small quantities, and cannot obtain labourers for it at any price. Eight thousand adults at this moment introduced would have no serious effect on the labour market—and by creating new farms you could provide employment for any number of labourers you could send out. It takes about five years' employment as a labourer before enough is earned to leave the labour market. The moment a labourer leaves the market,

* * * * as definitively settling this question in the affirmative." Assuming, then, the extent of such an atmosphere "to be considerable—not merely in absolute measure—but as an aliquot part of the sun's radius," its form, in virtue of the laws of fluid equilibrium, must be oblately spheroidal, and consequently its equatorial thickness greater than its polar thickness. Hence, the escape of heat must be greater from the polar than from the equatorial zone, and the latter must possess a higher temperature. In this respect, the sun resembles our own earth; and on this supposition our author thus reasons respecting the causes of the spots:—

"The spots in this view of the subject would come to be assimilated to those regions on the earth's surface in which, for the moment, hurricanes and tornadoes prevail—the upper stratum being temporarily carried downwards, displacing by its impetus the two strata of luminous matter beneath, (which may be conceived as forming an habitually tranquil limit between the opposite upper and under currents,) the upper, of course, to a greater extent than the lower—thus wholly or partially denuding the opaque surface of the sun below. Such processes cannot be unaccompanied with vorticose motions, which, left to themselves, die away by degrees, and dissipate; with this peculiarity, that their lower portions come to rest more speedily than their upper, by reason of the greater resistance below, as well as the remoteness from the point of action, which lies in a higher region, so that their centre (as seen in our water-spouts, which are nothing but small tornadoes) appears to retreat upwards. Now, this agrees perfectly with what is observed during the obliteration of the solar spots, which appear as if filled in by the collapse of their sides, the penumbra closing in upon the spot, and disappearing after it."

We have been much disappointed at finding that Sir John Herschel either has not observed or has not described the extraordinary structure of the *fully luminous* disc of the sun, as we and others have repeatedly seen it through Sir James South's great Achromatic;—a structure which should have been more distinctly seen at the Cape than in our climate! This structure of which, if we recollect rightly, we have seen a beautiful drawing made by Mr. Gwilt, resembles compressed curd, or white Almond soap, or a mass of asbestos fibres lying in a *quadraversus* direction, and compressed into a solid mass. There can be no illusion in this phenomenon:—It is seen by every person with good vision, and on every part of the sun's luminous surface or envelope; and we think affords an ocular demonstration that that surface or envelope is not a *flame*, but a soft solid, or thick fluid maintained in an incandescent state by subjacent heat, and capable of being disturbed by differences of temperature, and broken up as we see it when the sun is covered with spots or openings in the luminous matter.

letters from the humbler classes express the same feeling. She mentions that large sums of money, consisting of £5 and £10 orders are continually sent from Australia. She adds, "we regret to say, that these orders often do not reach the person for whom they are intended; and even when they do, that they are not always applied to the purpose for which they are meant."* She suggests an Emigration Society, being convinced that sums intended to aid the emigration of relatives, or to purchase land when an opportunity arises, would be entrusted to such a society, instead of being hazarded as they now are, or, as is often the case, actually buried for the purposes of safety or concealment by the Australian shepherd. She assumes the land sold, and the produce applied in emigration on a plan not identical with Wakefield's, but preserving what is most valuable in the principle of his system. And Sir Thomas Mitchell's late discoveries suggest this as a proper time for new regulations: such a society as she contemplates would have the advantage of being a place of deposit for the smallest savings of families intending emigration, and the money so deposited might be instrumental in sending labour to the colony long before the intended emigrant could himself go.

Since Mrs. Chisholm's return, 4071 persons have applied to her for a free passage, and she has no doubt of the immediate comfortable support and maintenance of three times the number in the colony, could a free passage be given. This opinion is confirmed by the evidence of several witnesses. Mr. Coghill, a large landed proprietor, and a member of the Legislative Council at Sydney, says that it is the interest of everybody in the colony, of whatever class, that labour should be obtained. Quite irrespective of Sir Thomas Mitchell's discoveries in the interior, the colony could easily take from a thousand to twelve hundred a month, without lowering wages too much. The evidence as to New Brunswick leads to many of the same results as that concerning the Australian colonies. Undirected and unassisted, emigration is likely to fail; while, with proper preparation, the colony could find employment for vast numbers. The success of the Harvey and Teetotal Settlements is solely attributable to the emigrants being given road-contracts, and thus obtaining the means of cultivating the land on which they were located, till it was able to support them. The roads were not roads undertaken for the support of these people, but were great leading lines of road connecting principal points, and of the

* Father Mathew's experience has been different:—"I have received these letters in hundreds and hundreds, containing remittances, forming in the aggregate a great amount. All the parties who so received money, availed themselves of it for the purpose of emigration. I do not know any case in which they have applied the money to any other purpose."—*Mathew* (2416).

utmost importance to the colony. On the formation, then, of such roads, of which some few were projected but dropped for want of means, and on the execution of the contemplated railway from Quebec to Halifax, passing through the centre of New Brunswick throughout its whole length, would depend the possibility of making much use of this colony for emigration purposes. The advantages of thus opening the country would be sufficient reason for undertaking these works; and it is not unreasonable to believe that an object, advantageous both to the colony and to the parent country, and to which the colony is disposed to contribute, can scarcely be allowed to languish for want of funds. For every emigrant employed on the railway, four would find employment on works that would spring up throughout the province in consequence of the railway. The proposed communication with Halifax would unite our North American colonies into one, and the steamers which now cross the Atlantic with such certainty and such rapidity, would make them part and parcel of the United Kingdom. "If some means of enabling Quebec and the St. Lawrence to communicate with the sea through British territory be not soon constructed, the whole trade of Canada will probably find its way to Europe through the United States.* If Canada, and the Western country—the granaries of America (for Massachusetts, New York, and Maine do not, I believe, produce their own grain,)—are to be served by Republican American railways, commerce will flow in that direction, and the people, with their affections and interests, will follow. One effect of the Halifax and Quebec Railway would be to link the British colonies together, establish a closer connexion with the Western States of America, and fraternize their population with British America. The feelings of the descendants of those who took arms against the British flag, are very different from the feelings of the inhabitants of the Western States of America. The latter have kindly feelings towards the old country, where they have left relatives and friends behind them."—*Uniacke*. The proposed railway would open for settlement between four and five million acres of land. It would open a line of railway between 450 and 500 miles long. Mr. Uniacke (a resident of Nova Scotia, and a member of the Provincial Parliament,) suggests the disposal of land in a way that would secure to the public the advantage of any increase in its value. He would divide the land opened by the proposed work into lots, and sell or lease each alternate lot, reserving the adjoining one. As the value of the reserved lots must be supposed to increase greatly by the completion of the works, it would afford the opportunity of selling those to be

* Colonization from Ireland, *Perley*, p. 36.

now parted with at a more reasonable rate. Work upon the road would supply the labourer with support, and Mr. Uniacke suggests a savings-bank system of weekly deposits of a part of his wages, to pay for his lot of ground. With this security he might be allowed at once to occupy it, and receive an absolute title whenever the purchase money was paid. The rate of wages is from two shillings to two and sixpence a-day, while the price of living is not greater than in Ireland. It is calculated that on the plan of alternate settlements and reserves, the rents of the reserved lots, at the completion of the work, would almost repay the expense of its construction.

The New Brunswick Land Company dissuade the sending indigent men, on any supposition that they can be supported by the existing means of the colony. The principal business of the province is the timber trade and ship-building. The province does not supply itself with provisions. Agriculture is a secondary pursuit. The newly arrived emigrant could not obtain employment in the timber trade, every detail of work in which he would have to learn; and in agriculture, the only emigrant likely to succeed would be the small farmer, who had means to buy out the original clearer. As to labourers, there is at present an annual shoal of labourers, to the average amount of 7000, of whom about 4000 remain, and are absorbed in New Brunswick.* To increase this number would be to expose the persons so sent to starvation. Farmers, in short, who can afford to pay wages, are the persons to thrive here. If the Halifax railway be undertaken, it would greatly vary the matter. In that case such indigent labourers as may be sent from Europe must be governed by American managers, and aided and instructed by native labourers used to forest work.

With reference to Canada itself, we have not left ourselves room to give any summary of the evidence, but there is abundant reason to be satisfied, beyond the possibility of a doubt, that wherever great public works have been undertaken, and the resources of the country developed, the wilderness has blossomed into life, and commerce and civilisation sprung forth into instant birth. The settlements along the Rideau canal are exclusively to be attributed to that undertaking; and we are told by one of the most intelligent witnesses, (Mr. Pemberton,)

* "The whole number of emigrants who had arrived in New Brunswick during the present year, amounted on the 1st October, to 15,269, being an excess over the emigrants of last year of 5720. One-third proceeded to the United States. The two-thirds who remained, were of 'the most miserable and helpless class of Irish peasantry.' Heads of families went to the States leaving their families behind them a burden on the people of New Brunswick."—*Sir W. Colebrooke's Dispatches. Emigration Papers, No. 17.*

that every one acquainted with Canada, to the north of the lakes, would agree in the opinion, that it is capable of maintaining a population almost equal to that of Great Britain, if its resources were fully developed.

We have some evidence respecting Prince Edward's Island, from Mr. Cunard, to whom the world is indebted for the establishment of intercourse by steam navigation between Great Britain and British North America. In Lord Durham's Report it is stated, that of 1,400,000 acres, not 10,000 are unfit for the plough; and that, had the natural advantages of the island been turned to a proper account, instead of supporting a "poor and unenterprising" population of 40,000, its mere agricultural resources would have maintained in abundance ten times that number. Mr. Cunard has no doubt of this island being able to maintain at least ten times the number that it does, but he differs from Lord Durham's Report as to the cause of its non-cultivation. The original gift of the island to a few large grantees seemed to Lord Durham to give the solution of a fact, on which he and Mr. Cunard are agreed. There is no difficulty in obtaining land in the island, on most advantageous terms; and the original grantees, who are assumed by Lord Durham to have neglected the conditions of their grants, and evaded bringing out settlers, did, in point of fact, expend vast sums for that object, of which they never got back a tenth part. The fact is, that the history of all our colonies—perhaps of all colonies—is, that the capital expended in founding a new colony, is invariably lost;* and to this Prince Edward's Island was no exception. "I never knew," says Mr. Cunard, "any one except a labourer, one who cultivated the land with his own hands, get a return." To that class, however, supposing them not in actual indigence, Mr. Cunard recommends Prince Edward's Island; of that class he has scarce known an industrious man to fail. He himself owns one-fifth of the island. He makes roads through his lands, and extends these as he learns that tenants are coming. He lays out land in lots of fifty acres each, fronting the road;† gives his tenants employment on the roads; and grants them leases of 999

* See Colonization from Ireland. Appendix, page 27. Letter from Mr. Moxon.

† Mr. Cunard does not willingly give farms of more than 50 acres each; he, however, reserves adjacent lots for the holders of such farms. In New Brunswick, Sir William Colebrooke informs us that the same principle is acted on. "Locations of 50 acres were chosen as sufficient in extent for a first occupancy, and by reserving the lots in the rear of the first concessions, an opportunity of extension was afforded. Without the reserve of common lands in the settlement, no improving tenant is contented with a smaller occupancy, or is willing to be deprived of the privilege of enlarging it for the settlement of his family growing up around him. The possession of land, in his own right, is the main stimulus to his exertions, &c."—*Emigration Papers*, 1847. *New Brunswick*, No. 3.

years, held for the first two or three years for nothing, then at threepence, sixpence, and finally, a shilling an acre. The tenant has at any time, during the continuance of the lease, a right to have the fee at twenty years' purchase. A great many of his tenants have commenced without capital; in fact, the head of a family having £10 above the world he would consider an eligible tenant; to a mere pauper he would not give his land. The English farmers he thinks the best settlers; the Irish, from a farming district, the next; their children are very good. The descendants of the Irish make excellent settlers. We do not understand him to wish the emigration, now consisting of about eight hundred annually, to be increased under present circumstances; but, supposing provision made for their maintenance, he says, "I think you might send out five hundred families, or a thousand families, computing a family at five or six persons."

With respect to New Zealand, the Committee have as yet scarcely received any evidence.

An intelligent witness, Mr. Innes, has been examined as to the West Indies. In British Guiana, Trinidad, and Jamaica, occupation would be found for a considerable European population. As to health, the all but universal opinion of the medical men in British Guiana was, that it would be quite possible for Europeans to labour in the morning and the evening for such periods as to enable them to do twice a negro's day's-work; but nothing can be done till a new mode of dealing with the West India estates is introduced, and till the business of cultivating the cane is separated from that of the manufacture of sugar. "Every estate, however small, has its complete set of works, and each its manager, who is responsible for the proper cultivation of the land, the manufacture of the sugar, and the distillation of the rum. The manager has not served an apprenticeship to any one of these very distinct branches of business, he is selected from the overseers of a few years' standing, and the overseers are young men fresh from school." At present no land can be cultivated but on an extensive scale; the field, the boiling-house, and the distillery, under the same superintendence, cannot afford any adequate profit. Introduce a proper division of labour, let the manufacturer's business be a separate occupation, and then a few acres may be cultivated with the same proportionate advantage as a large estate. Mr. Innes admits the great mortality among emigrants from Madeira who have been brought to some of the islands in 1846, but ascribes it to causes capable of being obviated—to their being put to live in cottages built of ~~new~~ and unseasoned wood, and being employed too soon in full labour. The anxiety for labour is such in Demerara, that they offer a bounty on emigrants from Madeira and the Azores, greater than the cost of removing labourers from Ireland.

Of one portion of the evidence we have hitherto avoided giving any detailed account, as indeed we regard the incidental notices given by some of the witnesses not sufficient to help us to any conclusion—it is that of the fitness of the Irish to be placed together in detached colonies. Our own impression is, that they are best when mingled and interspersed with other settlers, and that the more they can be blended with others the better for all. In Canada, the feeling and disposition of settlers of different races is to keep themselves distinct. The Catholics of the Scottish Highlands, the Lowland Scottish Presbyterians, and the Acadian French, have each their separate settlements. This is man's nature; and the German emigrant and the Irishman will act as far as he can on the same feeling. We have no right to interrupt such arrangements, and the poor people themselves do all they can to bring around them their old friends, and their old associations. All this, as far as it can be rendered instrumental to good, or rather, as far as it is not evil, we are disposed to assist and encourage, as far as it can be assisted and encouraged without incurring the danger of introducing into other regions the vicious habits of the land which they have left. Self-dependence, reliance on his own exertions, and not on the banded partisanship which disregards all truth and all justice, and which in Ireland is substituted for obedience to law, is, we think, a lesson more likely to be learned by the Irish colonist, when he finds himself among men of other birth and race. On this subject, however, the evidence is imperfect. As far as it goes, it is more favourable to the Irishmen when in clusters of their own countrymen than we should have anticipated. There is a settlement of Irish in the Island of Cape Breton. In the year 1798 a number of natives of the counties of Cork and Waterford fled from Ireland during the disturbances, and settled at Cape Breton. They at first planted themselves on the land without any title. Their possession was, however, afterwards legalized. The settlement is exclusively Irish,—“They are well off, free from debt, with good farms, and quantities of stock, and it is looked upon as one of the most thriving settlements in the Island.”* We have before spoken of another Irish settlement, but we are on the whole—unless a system of colonization, larger than any at all likely to be contemplated, be sanctioned by the Legislature—strongly disposed to prefer the settlement of Irish emigrants in societies already formed.

The plan of sending out into the wilderness members of all classes, on some supposition of thus creating anew an image of the parent country, is one that does not promise much. The

* Col. from Ireland, Uniacke, page 50.

chances of improvement seem to us to depend on the separation of the Irishman, of whatever class, from all his habitual associations, and we are glad to have the decisive authority of Father Mathew confirming this view—and Father Mathew's authority is no light one in these matters. "I have not," says this sensible, intelligent, and good man, "I have not read any of those essays on emigration or colonization, nor Mr. Godley's pamphlet, nor any thing of the kind,"—and he has not the faith that some of the witnesses have, that the Irish blackguard will at last blossom into something divine and beautiful,

And in another country, as they say
Bear a bright golden flower, but not in this soil.

We are told by some of the witnesses that in Ireland—"*cloud-land—gorgeous-land*,"—

Crime has less depravity,
Murder more of suavity,

that there are leaders of White-boys who do not look like ruffians—that your Irish ruffians are persons falling in with the manners of the society in which they live, and in a new society would probably lead exemplary lives. In some future stage of transatlantic being, they are to exhibit all the qualities of the Irishman—still distinct but improved and glorified.

"Nothing of him that doth fade,
But doth suffer a sea-change
Into something rich and strange."

There is something not untrue in all this, however fanciful it may seem; still the only chance of the magic sea-change will be by breaking all habitual associations, not carrying with him all the elements of society in the parent country. "When the Irish congregate together, they always remain the same—they never improve—witness St. Giles's, Calmel Buildings, and Cato Street, and other places, where the Irish have lived from time immemorial. They are always the same, and of the same habits and dispositions as at home, and dissipation and rioting are perpetuated among them."* We dwell on this, because a good deal of the examinations of the Committee is directed to the purpose of ascertaining whether it would not be desirable to bring out, as parts of one society, the squire as well as the labourer and the farmer. Distinctions of rank will soon create themselves; and the State need not occupy itself in assisting the structure of a new feudalism, still less in giving any countenance to the fiction of clanship, which,

* Mathew, (2459.)

at no time whatever since the conquest of Ireland, had even an apparent existence in any part of the island ; and any attempt to realize which, either in Ireland or in the colonies, would be to excite into antagonist action the power of imagination, which resents, and will resist, every effort that may be made to impose on it. There can be no reason for not assisting the emigration of men, of whatever rank, in connexion with any extensive plan that may be adopted ; but let it not for a moment be proposed, as a subject in which the emigrating peasantry feel the slightest interest on the principles of clanship or vassalage. Clanship never existed in the imagined case ; and one of the advantages which the emigrant proposes, is breaking the bonds of vassalage. Another dream put forward ostentatiously, and with all the solemnity of a matured plan, was Mr. Godley's proposal of a vast Celtic colony, led by the Roman Catholic clergy, who were to be their governors and guides. Father Mathew is a better witness as to the views of the Roman Catholic clergy than Mr. Godley can be, and, on the general subject, is not the worse authority, from being uninfected with any theory. With him we shrink altogether from the notion of a Celtic colony, in any view of it that has been yet presented ; and this form of a theocracy is, we think, the least practicable, and, if practicable, the least desirable of all. The project, if successful, could but end in a *Jesuit reduction* ; but this project, advanced in a memorial to Lord John Russell, and for a while insisted on by people who appeared to be in earnest, need scarcely be now discussed, as, in his examination before Lord Monteagle's Committee, Mr. Godley's view dwindled into making some arrangements for the moderate payment of chaplaincies on the same principle as has been adopted in workhouses and gaols, and which, when once admitted, there seems nothing unreasonable in applying in the case of colonists. At all events, we are not thrown upon the discussion of the question involved in what seemed to be Mr. Godley's original proposal.

We have exceeded the limits which can be conveniently given to this Article, and yet we have left parts of the subject untouched ; nay, almost unapproached. It is not possible to consider emigration from Ireland without some reference to the existing Poor Law, and its proposed modifications. Dr. Chalmers, when examined in 1830 before a Committee on the state of the Poor of Ireland, warned the Committee of the inevitable effects of the proposed legislation. If your poor laws—such was his reasoning—relieve but the impotent and the aged, this will not prevent the robust labourer from forcing his way to England. If an allowance be given to able-bodied labourers, and this be not extended to all, it will diminish the wages of all, which will

increase the necessity and the temptation of this apprehended immigration; "or, lastly," and now we must give his own words, (*absit omen!*) "if, in order to meet this, it be proposed to extend allowances to able-bodied labourers—to the population *en masse*, this, without after all accomplishing the object of lessening immigration, would lead the country to such expense as would be tantamount to an extinction of its landed property." The modifications of the Poor Law, by Mr. Sharman Crawford and Lord Sligo, would even go farther than came within Dr. Chalmers' prophetic anticipation of possible consequences. In England, the occupant is alone subject to the poor-rates—he, who alone has the power of giving or withholding employment from the labourers—has alone to bear a tax which it is presumed arises from the labourers of a district being insufficiently employed. This, like other matters, formed a part of his calculation when the dealing with his landlord was entered into, and the rent which he undertook to pay was not to be afterwards diminished by the fact of whether poor-rates were in any particular year higher than the average. The farmers in an agricultural district were the employers of labour, and on them, and not on the proprietors, from whose capital the expenditure on labour was in no case derived, did the burthen fall. From some circumstances, as he thought, peculiar to Ireland, Mr. Nicholls, in contradiction to his own deductions from scientific principles, and excused, perhaps, in some degree, for the deviation, by the fact that his Poor Law went little farther than making some provision, not for able-bodied labourers, but for the impotent poor, recommended that the payment of the rate should be divided equally between the owner and the occupier; adding, however, to his recommendation, the advice that this division should be at the earliest possible moment abandoned, and the law be the same on this subject in both England and Ireland.* In Nicholls's plan, however, on any view of it, the tax was but a rent charge affecting particular lands. The tenant who paid such was allowed to deduct from his rent a fixed proportion. Mr. Sharman Crawford, in the early part of 1847, proposed that the landlord's part should be payable by the landlord alone, and that in no case should any recourse be had to the particular lands till every other weapon of litigation had been exhausted. A man who had any other property was, by his plan, to pay for the name of property which gave him no return whatever. Impose a tax if you will, but do not, for no better reason than that of popular language calling that which a tenant is allowed to deduct from rent—and which on the supposition of his paying no rent has as yet no existence—"the

* Nicholls's First Report, Section 89.

landlord's part," assume that a debt exists between the landlord and the Poor Law Commissioners, and on an imagined state of facts do a grievous wrong. Lord Sligo gives a similar recommendation, not, however, as we understand him, going Mr. Crawford's lengths, which on principle demand the confiscation of any property whatever a man may possess, for the crime of having inherited property in Ireland. Lord Sligo would have the tenant protected from the visits of the tax-collector. We believe and know that the tax-collector is paid when the landlord is not. We believe and know that in the smaller properties—say estates of £400 and £500 a year—that the poor-rates have been paid to the collector, where no possible process of law could have extorted from the proprietor what he did not possess—and we have little doubt that, in any such cases as legal process might succeed in obtaining it, it would be scarce possible to get it repaid. Confiscation, to this extent, it is not probable that Dr. Chalmers foresaw. And we cannot but think that, if instead of regarding Ireland as an exception from the inferences which their science suggests to them in other cases, political economists, like Mr. Nicholls, sought to deal with it as with England, and as if Irishmen were men in all respects like themselves—they would be more successful. If they reduce the country to a dead level of society, in which there shall remain but the peer and the peasant, we cannot but fear both for the peasant and the peer. Without the intermediate classes, what is to separate, we will not say what is to distinguish from each other, the extremes? We, who admire and venerate both, "*Oh fortunate ninium sua si bona norint,*" fear for both, supposing them spared and the intermediate classes destroyed.

When it is said, as it often is, that Ireland could support a larger population than the present, it is not remembered that that larger population cannot be supported by the direct labours of agriculture. Assume the opportunity of improving its agriculture, which cannot arise till a considerable portion of the population is removed, and the result of such cultivation, as exists in the most highly improved districts of England, will be that for every eight men employed in husbandry, but three will henceforth be employed.* You cannot employ the existing population in agriculture at home, and they are unfit for any thing else; even for it, we lament to say, how wholly unskilled their labour is. Nothing can be more inconsistent than the expectations of those who look to an improved agriculture for the support of a larger agricultural population. Improved agriculture

* These are the proportionate numbers as stated in Godley's Memorial. Five to two is the proportion as calculated in the Third Report of the Poor-Law Commissioners.

will diminish, as in England, the number of those deriving their support from employment in the labours of husbandry. For a time, it is possible that the great works of river drainage, and the temporary operations under the Land Improvement Bill, may give an increased demand for labour; but such works cannot, as Captain Larcom tells the Colonization Committee, last indefinitely, and, if long continued, they, as he shows, but increase the evil. In many cases, we know that on the public works in the most disturbed parts of the country, before the exceptional years of 1846 and 1847, a fair day's work was often given for a fair day's wages, and the officers of the Board of Works have persuaded themselves that the fault was altogether that of the local employers of labour that the case was ever otherwise. The half-crown, which in England would have been given for one man's work, must in Ireland be divided among five claimants for support, who do not give each of them sixpenny-worth of work; and the officer of the Board of Works, who has only to look to the fact of whether fair wages are earned or not, will have nothing to say to the class of persons whom the farmer or the resident proprietor cannot but in some way seek to support. It has been a hundred times shewn, how a small excess of hands reduces the wages of all; and from this fact alone Malthus presses emigration, as, in circumstances less desperate than those of Ireland, the only remedy that a people can adopt. The coercion, under which well-disposed labourers are compelled, by the claimants who crowd the labour-market, to do as little as is at all possible, is described by several of the witnesses—best, perhaps, by De Vere, whose evidence it would be well to print separately. Private persons have never been able to break down this kind of combination; but it has been entirely defeated very often by the persons employed on public works. In 1845, Mr. Mulvany, the Drainage Commissioner, was anxious to try the effect of task-work, on some works in the county of Tipperary. The works passed through the property of Mr. Waller of Finnoe—who, with his wife, and sister-in-law, were the subjects of one of the most frightful tragedies that has occurred even in Ireland—and bordered on the property of Mr. Hunt, who was shot a short time before the works commenced. The acting engineer, Mr. Farrell of Loughrea, succeeded in persuading the men whom he employed to disregard the threatening notices by which it was sought to intimidate them, and they soon became excellent workmen. "Where fair money wages are given," this is his inference from the case we have stated, and others of the same kind, "the Irish would become as good workmen as any in England or Scotland." We have no doubt of it; but the difficulties which the engineer meets and overcomes in

these occasional works, are not those which the resident agriculturist has to encounter. The farmer cannot select his men, nor do the ordinary farming operations give employment, like a line of road or some great drainage work, to the population of a district. The persons who speak of the fitness of each townland supporting its own poor, are using a language absolutely without meaning in numberless cases. The inhabitants of many of the poorer districts, as, for instance, the west of the county of Cork, and parts of Kerry, found at home no demand for their labour. They lived by supplying labour to the inland parts of the country—Tipperary, Limerick, and Kilkenny. They left their homes at the commencement of the corn harvest, remained till after the potato digging, and then returned. Their visits, however desirable to the farmer, were to the native labourer unwelcome, for he was thrown out of employment, or his wages reduced. At the period of the potato disease their occupation entirely ceased, and they crowded into the city of Cork in thousands. Father Mathew tells us, that of these creatures ten thousand died in the city of Cork in the summer of 1847. The districts from which these famished creatures came neither now nor at any time supported their population. As labourers, earning their livelihood by emigration to England or the inland parts of Ireland—as mendicants, wandering in droves with their whole families along the highways—now and then as fishermen, seeking a precarious subsistence from the sea, but in no case deriving their sustenance from the wretched soil on which they lived, did they contrive to exist. Yet is there no one of those who is not, when roused by circumstances, capable of intense exertion; and there can be no reasonable doubt, that with the inspiration of hope, they would become in all things equal to any European people. We are anxious for emigration, that men may have room to breathe at home;—we are anxious for emigration, that men may be able to enlarge their country;—we are anxious that it should be assisted by landed proprietors, not for their sakes alone, not for their tenants' sakes alone, but for the common interests of both, and for the interests of the country and of the colonies. We believe that of an increasing population, no longer supported by agriculture alone, in a very few years there will be scarce a family of any rank, many members of which will not have passed to the colonies, which steam has already made almost a part of the country. Why should there be these processes of ejection?—why this war between landlord and tenant? At a few weeks' sail from Ireland is land offered as the certain reward of industry. Numbers, unaided by the State, have found a home in America or Australia. We wish the State to aid them, not for the sake of the State alone, but that those

who leave us should feel that they still form part of the same community, and are not separated from us as diseased limbs from a decaying body. In the colonies the one feeling that animates to untiring industry the more successful emigrant, is the hope of becoming the owner of land. This is a hope which cannot be gratified in Ireland. Whether well or ill cultivated, there is not an acre of land in the whole island that is not preoccupied; and this alone is a sufficient answer to the repeated assertions of there being abundant waste land, which might be brought into cultivation, and on which, we are gravely told, that the thousands and tens of thousands who annually emigrate might be advantageously located. The waste lands of Ireland are not cultivated, because, for the most part, they would not repay the expense of cultivation. With respect to emigration, we think it would be impolitic, and that it would defeat its intended purpose, were any efforts made to stimulate the desire which at present possesses such numbers to seek their fortune in other lands. To aid, to regulate, to organize, to suggest some definite hope instead of the present vague expectations of uncertain good, and to assist in its accomplishment—to prepare the emigrant for his future home, and to provide a home for him in the wilderness, or in the city, as his purposes may suggest—for it is not for the agriculturist alone that emigration is desirable—this surely is the duty of the State. Let no man leave the land to whom the locality in which he lives affords the means of support. Let no man go who does not feel that to emigrate is to give him not alone the chance, but the certainty, of improving his condition. We have not left ourselves room for more. In Lord Monteagle's speech, on introducing the motion for a Committee, he distinctly denied that he had any such object in view as a "gigantic emigration," displacing some two or three millions. There are but certain localities that are overpeopled. "A very small excess of labour will beat down wages through a whole district. The removal of that excess will raise the condition of the entire class of labourers." We conclude in the words of Lord Sydenham, quoted by Lord Monteagle:—

"Emigration to America holds out no brilliant prospects of rapid affluence; but at the same time it is secure, under proper management, from the risk of equally rapid failure. It is no lottery with a few exorbitant prizes, but a secure and certain investment, in which a prudent and sensible man may safely embark. It may be affirmed, that no industrious man ever failed, on this continent, to make an easy livelihood by his labour; that no capitalist, with a fair share of agricultural knowledge, who has chosen to invest his money in the purchase of land, has had reason to complain of an insufficient return. Almost any labourer, with good conduct and perseverance, may in a

few years become a landholder. These are results of perseverance, industry, and steadiness."

The evidence already given before the Committee seems to prove that emigration, on an extensive scale, is the only condition on which exertions at all adequate to the occasion can be made for the present support of the population of Ireland, or the future improvement of that unhappy country. The undirected emigration that now goes on is scarcely a relief—nay, it may be easily shown that it often increases the evil. To the colonies, even those most in want of labour, the mass flung upon them, without any provision for their support, is, instead of a benefit, too frequently an insufferable grievance. To the emigrant himself, a project which, conducted with any reasonable forethought, would be certain of a prosperous issue, too often terminates in ruin. To what extent the State ought to go in encouraging emigration—from what funds the removal of the indigent shall be supplied—if it be thought fit that they should be removed, may be a matter of doubt and of difficulty; but surely there ought to be no doubt or difficulty in regulating the emigration which exists—and by the introduction of something of system into what is now conducted almost without a plan, to give effectual relief to the emigrant, to the parent country, and to the colonies.

- ART. VIII.—1. *A Bill to provide for the Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages in Scotland.* 1847.
2. *A Bill to amend the Law of Scotland affecting the Constitution of Marriage.* 1847.
3. *Speech of the Lord Advocate on the Marriage and Registration (Scotland) Bills.* 1847.

THE subject of the Bills, and the relative Speech of the Lord Advocate, which are prefixed to this Article, is a social question of far greater real moment to Scotland than many of those topics of agitation and indignation which occupy so large a proportion of the spare zeal of our countrymen. We are rather late ourselves in giving it the prominence it deserves; but late as we are, we are before any of our contemporaries in this respect. It is a subject which, interesting as it is to all classes, is probably one on which the great majority, both of Scotsmen and Englishmen, are as little informed as if the law relating to it were that of a foreign State. We believe our readers will not think our space or their time ill bestowed when devoted to an attempt to elucidate the present genius and spirit of the Marriage Law of Scotland, and the nature of the proposed modifications of it.

We cannot, however, approach the consideration of this question, which is of all others one to be considered in the spirit of calmness and philosophy—a subject which the most erudite and subtle jurists, the most learned divines, and the most eminent statesmen, have thought worthy of the deepest and most earnest disquisition—without trying to emerge from the strange and vulgar atmosphere of clamour, prejudice, and ignorance by which it has been surrounded. That there are topics connected with the proposed measure which fairly admit of difference of opinion, we do not by any means dispute; and the object of our present remarks, after explaining the position of the matters in debate, is to examine these in the spirit of candid inquiry. But first let us escape from the rabble rout of clergy and laity, conveners and moderators, kirk-sessions, schoolmasters, and Commissioners of Supply, who joined full cry in the chase when these devoted measures were first started. From one end of Scotland to the other, the Established Church and the lairds were open-mouthed against it, and swelled the discordant din with which its appearance was saluted. Not that there was anything in their notes of preparation like the harmony so grateful to the huntsman's ear; they were a disorderly and ill-assorted pack, pulling

all ways, and going off on all scents—equally false in every case. In many instances, the more zealous defenders of Scottish matrimony as it is, had not taken even the ordinary trouble of reading the obnoxious document. One man condemned it as legalizing clandestine marriages; another, as preventing freedom of marriage, even the least clandestine. One orator saw in it an insult to the Church; another found it to be a mere engine of priestcraft. Whether its operation was supposed to make marriage more easy or less so—more ecclesiastical or more secular—it was all the same; and sometimes, where more than average zeal came to unite with more than average ignorance in one excited presbyter or proprietor, all these grounds combined to fill up the measure of his denunciation.

This is no novelty in Scottish legislation. Few social reforms have been accomplished among us without some similar display. It was formerly the custom in Scotland for the Judges to select the Jury; and our readers may easily suppose what chance the accused would have had, in the times of Muir and Palmer, from a Jury so selected. This abuse was remedied some twenty-five years ago; but it will hardly be credited that there was scarcely a county or Royal Burgh in Scotland that did not petition Parliament in favour of a system which no man would now venture to defend, and protest against the downfall of that system as dangerous and revolutionary. Although we think the present example of this spirit one of the least creditable to the sense or candour of our country that we remember, we are not sure that even groundless clamour may not bring its own advantages along with it. It is something in favour of the stability of our social framework that it resists, in the first instance, the hand of change; and we should not have at all desired that an alteration on a law which strikes its roots so deeply into society should have been allowed to pass uncanvassed or ill-considered. The loud and ineffective artillery which has hitherto blazed over it may at least serve to clear the air, and show us more distinctly our field of battle; and probably the very absurdity of the assault, in the first instance, will lead the public more surely right in the end. On the other hand, we certainly shall say nothing to depreciate the importance—nay, the sanctity—of the question itself. An institution which is the parent, not the child, of civil society—so divinely and solemnly sanctioned, and so deeply interwoven with national and individual worthiness and wellbeing—the golden hinge on which the doors of the social system revolve—the good genius of our transitory and ill-balanced world, who casts her benign spell equally over the palace and the humblest roof, and can light up the eye of penury and lighten the brow of care—that indissoluble chain which binds the human family together,

and unites them to heaven—is well worthy of being guarded by the most watchful jealousy. We do not blame the zeal, but the knowledge and discretion of the onset. But now that the platooning is over, we hope that a few words of explanation on a topic so important may perhaps find a hearing from the public.

It is not our intention, nor is it at all necessary for our present object, to enter on any abstract discussion on the nature or origin of marriage. Indeed, while there may be theoretical difference in this respect among philosophical jurists, it is agreed among them in the main, that marriage is a contract divinely sanctioned, prescribed by nature, and regulated by civil society. It is at once a religious, natural, and civil contract, and truly requires, both by our own law, and, as we hold, in its own nature, nothing for its completion but the free and deliberate consent of parties. This we take to be truly the law of all Protestant Europe. But then it has been uniformly the practice, even among those Christian nations who reject the Catholic invention of its sacramental character, to regulate, for the public benefit, and the preservation and integrity of the institution itself, and the mode in which such consent shall be evinced and proved. The right of civil government so to protect one of the most sacred of its defences is unquestionable, and would be sufficiently evinced by the fact, that marriage itself is not more universal than the solemnities and ceremonies by which its constitution is celebrated. Thus it has been, that in all nations, and in all time, marriage has been wont to be promulgated and announced by the performance of religious rites, and in the face of an assembly of friends or of the public. The legal systems of different nations have it is true, differed widely on the question, What evidence of consent should be held sufficient to legalize the matrimonial union? While some seem to hold the religious ceremony, or the sacerdotal benediction, to be almost essential, others allow the merest or most ordinary indications of consent, *de præsenti*, to be sufficient to complete the contract. Canonists and juridical writers have refined on this subject with much ingenuity and subtlety; but the real practical question to be solved is, How shall the evidence of matrimonial consent be made certain, public, and safe, without throwing undue impediments in the way of an institution which is provided for, and open to, all? It is needless, therefore, to dwell longer on technical distinctions. The right of the civil government to provide that the evidence of consent shall be explicit and clear, is admitted on all hands, on whatever basis marriage itself may be abstractly rested; and while we do not advocate, but deprecate restraints on marriage, we do not consider it limiting, but enlarging and increasing its sphere, to make the evidence of it certain, as well as the constitution of it easy.

In the course of his public duty, the present Lord Advocate found it necessary—as no one can doubt that it is most necessary—to provide a public register for births, deaths, and marriages in Scotland. The state of our public records on this subject are well known to have been thoroughly disgraceful, productive not only of extreme inconvenience and uncertainty, but opening a wide door to fraud on the one hand, and tending to defeat just claims on the other. But in adjusting the terms and provisions of this measure, his attention was necessarily attracted to the state of the Scottish marriage law; and as it was perfectly impossible to institute a register for marriages which should be of the slightest service while that law lasted, he found it desirable to introduce along with his Registration Bill, a Bill for Amending the Law of Marriage in Scotland.

Now, what is that Law of Marriage in Scotland, as it exists at present? It is very necessary to explain this accurately, because a very great proportion of the objections that have been urged against these Bills has arisen from total ignorance or oblivion of what our present marriage law is.

To our readers south of the Tweed, a Scottish marriage generally suggests a chariot and four—a blacksmith at his anvil—a kind of Vulcanic Hymen, with his hammer in one hand, and his prayer-book in the other—and a midnight ceremony lighted up by the lurid blaze of the forge. But Gretna Green marriages form but a slight portion of our subject; and we much fear that, as electricity rushes faster even than railway wheels, the telegraph will for the future sadly interfere with the vagaries of Wards in Chancery, and other troublesome young women. Our task relates to graver matters.

The foundation of the Marriage Law of Scotland, like that of all Europe, is the consent of parties, and this consent may be proved or inferred—1st, By public celebration by a clergyman; 2d, By a declaration before witnesses; 3d, By a verbal promise of marriage, followed by intercourse; and 4th, By mere cohabitation as man and wife, coupled with the general repute and belief of the public, that the parties were married. These matters may be established either by parole testimony, or by the most informal writing; and under these conditions, any boy of fourteen, or girl of twelve, may contract this most important and serious relation.

Now, we must fairly admit that we think it is not within the department of statute law to prevent improvident marriages, nor is the facility of marriage under our present law at all the principal grievance to be remedied. It is in vain to try to teach men and women prudence by Act of Parliament; and if the only object of the measure before us were to prevent boys and girls

from marrying in haste, and repenting at leisure, we should doubt both its wisdom and its usefulness. These are evils which must bring their own remedy, if they are to be redressed at all. Marriage is and ought to be free to all, who are of age and capacity to contract; and the Legislature would have a heavy burden laid on it, were it to undertake to see that bridegroom and bride were sufficiently provided for, before the banns were proclaimed. For the evils arising from such improvidence, society itself provides the cure; in moral culture on the one hand, and the example derived from the discontent, penury, and wretchedness, in which such unions result, on the other. It was well said by Mr. Fox, in his celebrated speech on the English Marriage Act, "that in such matters the heart of youth is wiser than the head of age, and that the consequences of ill-advised marriages, were such as the Legislature of this country could not prevent, any more than it could by power or by art overcome all the other dispensations of nature."

But the evils of the present law of marriage in Scotland lie much deeper. If the constitution of marriage should be free—should be easy, and within the reach of all, it ought above all things to be certain. Not surrounded by cumbrous ceremonies, which the simplicity of a natural contract does not require—not barred and bolted in by the iron hand of statute law—but simple in its certainty as in its constitution. The consent, out of which the contract springs, should be so tendered and so received, that neither party should be able either to doubt of, or to defeat its efficacy. This is surely elementary in the principle of marriage. In a relation from which spring all the privileges, duties, and results of the domestic condition—status, legitimacy, inheritance, on which all society is built, it is surely not a matter on which argument need be expended, but a self-evident postulate to be assumed, that the contraction of it should be *certain*. That either party at the date of the contract itself, should be in doubt whether the obligation had been incurred, or the relation constituted or not, is an absurdity which, when the nature and results of the contract are considered, is absolutely revolting to the moral sense.

Now the modes by which marriage may be constituted at present by the Law of Scotland, only require to be enunciated, to suggest at once the long train of evils to which they necessarily give rise. We shall shortly consider each of them separately.

Of marriage as ordinarily celebrated by a clergyman we need not speak at present. We may have one or two remarks to make on that part of the subject when we come to explain the law as to clandestine marriages. It is to the *irregular* modes of constituting marriage that we at present address ourselves.

And, *first*, of declaration or acknowledgment of marriage before witnesses.

According to the Law of Scotland, if the contracting parties acknowledge before witnesses that they are husband and wife, that of itself constitutes marriage.

Now, that a deliberate and solemn declaration by the contracting parties, that they have undertaken the duties and obligations of husband and wife is, when proved by sufficient evidence in the abstract, a legitimate and effectual mode of constituting the contract, we have no occasion to deny. But what we desiderate is, that there should be some assurance that the consent is solemn and deliberate—and that words spoken in jest—or in thoughtlessness—or in wantonness, should not hold the same station in legal efficacy, as the unequivocal and earnest declaration of a present contract. We are quite aware that in principle, the law requires that the declaration shall truly mean what the words themselves import—that, in short, the intention shall correspond to the expression. But in how many cases may it, and does it happen, that a court of law has no other means of ascertaining intention, than the words proved to have been used. A student at one of our Universities, in an idle, or drunken, or unthinking moment, is betrayed either in writing or before bystanders into calling a girl his wife—he thinking nothing of the peculiarities of Scottish law, and perhaps a native of another country. Nothing farther takes place—he forgets the occurrence with his slumbers, and returns unsuspectingly to his home.—Years pass on, and the foolish boy has become a respectable and respected man. He is married and has a family, which he is bringing up with care and decency—when suddenly, just at the moment to annoy and confound the most, his Scottish wife, with her written acknowledgment, or her two famous witnesses, steps in to claim him. If the victim is fortunate enough to be able to satisfy a Court of Law, at so long an interval, and amid so many disadvantages, that the apparent contract was intended by both parties for a colour, he may escape with no more injury than the public exposure, and the private destruction of his peace. But if, as may too probably occur, he has no means of proof whatever—who shall paint—what pencil would be too bold, or what colours too deep to delineate—the scene of domestic horror which such a catastrophe would produce.

We do not sketch from fancy here:—and in our picture we have introduced an element which experience teaches us cannot be with certainty assumed. We assume that, in truth, there was consent expressed. But who does not see in the mere statement of such a case, how wide a door, and how deep a temptation is here thrown open to forgery or perjury? With how slight a

perversion of fact, may the precocious frolics of a schoolboy, or the thoughtless inexperience of a girl, be changed into such a declaration as the Law holds to constitute a marriage. And when the boy becomes a man of fortune, or the girl an heiress, it would be surprising if so brilliant a prize were not temptation strong enough for so easy a fraud.

If the picture be reversed, the evil is equally striking, and the hardship and injustice as great. A young woman is induced to consent to a private marriage, by interchange of writing, or declaration before witnesses—knowing, or being assured that such a marriage is valid by Law. Her husband, perhaps, has married below his station, and fear of offending relations induces the wife to consent to the marriage being concealed. The witnesses die—or the writing disappears, through accident or fraud. The husband, if living, repudiates the connexion—or he is dead, and his relations disown the widow, and leave her and her children to undeserved but irreparable shame and reproach.

It would be easy to multiply examples, but we content ourselves with quoting, from the Lord Advocate's speech, the following abstract of two very noted cases, which are familiar to our legal readers:—

“The first was one of great importance, and had given rise to one of the ablest judgments that had ever been delivered by one of the most distinguished judges on the English bench, the late Sir W. Grant. A gentleman, who was afterwards of high title and princely estate, contracted marriage, by writing, with a lady in Scotland, in 1802 or 1803—the only contract was an interchange of writings; and the marriage was kept strictly private—known only to the parties themselves. The gentleman subsequently came to England, and in 1808—being a man in that respect of no honour, and thinking perhaps that the evidence of his marriage had been lost, whereas it had been carefully preserved—paid his addresses to a lady belonging to one of the first families in England, and was accepted and married; but the lady was not married a year when the marriage was annulled at the suit of the lady who was the consenting party to the first marriage. Fortunately, there was no issue of the second marriage; but the English lady was reduced to a state of distress and degradation, if there could be degradation where there was no moral guilt, by discovering that she had married the husband of another living wife. The second case was that of a gentleman, who had lived for many years in concubinage with one of his domestic servants, and had several children by her. One day he called up all his servants, and this woman and her children, and without any religious ceremony, said, in the presence of his household, ‘I acknowledge this woman to be my wife, and these to be my children.’ It was not proved that she made any similar declaration; but she did not dissent from it. He then left the room, went about his grounds, gave some directions to his overseer, returned to his own room, and shot himself dead. Various

questions arose—first, as to the sanity of the man, and it was proved that he was perfectly sane; next, as to the validity of the marriage, which turned upon whether it was his intention to marry the woman, or only to leave her a widow, and entitle his children to his estate, to the disherison of those who would otherwise have been entitled to it. The question was closely argued, but ultimately the House of Lords decided the marriage to be good, and his child now possessed the estates, which were worth upwards of £20,000 a year. He could cite many other instances, but he thought these were enough to prove that the law of Scotland on this subject was most disgraceful, and without a parallel in the civilized world."

There is another result of this state of the law, and one far more frequent than perhaps our readers are the least aware of—the facilities, namely, which it gives to voluntary divorce. Where the evidence of the marriage is occult, and known only to the parties themselves, nothing is more easy than to form temporary unions of this kind, which may be terminated at the pleasure of the parties, whenever they become irksome or distasteful. A very frequent mode of marriage among some classes is to appear before a Justice of the Peace, after the Gretna Green fashion, and declare a marriage. In a recent case, which was tried at the Glasgow Circuit, evidence was given by a Justice of Peace, that in one year he had married between two and three hundred couples. That many of these matches are merely temporary, is, we believe, perfectly notorious; made, for instance, by journeymen workmen, whom a press of trade collects to a manufactory. When trade gets slack, the hands are reduced, the husband again becomes a bachelor, and waits for more prosperous times to renew the experiment of wedlock, probably in another quarter.

All this is sufficiently disgusting. Nor is our disgust lessened when we come to the constitution of marriage by promise, *cum copula*. According to the law of Scotland, if a man obtains possession of a woman's person under promise of marriage, present matrimonial consent is implied, and the law holds a marriage to be constituted.

There is at first sight a colour of justice and protection to the female in this provision, which excites, and naturally excites, popular sympathy in its favour. But a very little reflection will, we think, show, that as a safeguard of female honour, it is utterly powerless. For promises of that nature are rarely, or rather never, granted before witnesses; and if the parties are so deliberate as to reduce the promise into writing, the protection is hardly necessary. There is not one case out of a hundred in which it is possible to prove such a promise; and a reference to the oath of the party—the only remedy left—is not likely to be

of much avail with an adversary who stands confessed as a heartless seducer.*

On the other hand, if a declaration before witnesses leaves marriage doubtful, the mode of constituting it which we are now in course of considering, is uncertainty itself. It renders it impossible, or nearly impossible, for any man who has spent a profligate youth, to be certain whether he is married or not—a just retribution indeed on the offender himself, but one that entails undeserved calamities on innocent parties, who are bound to him by later ties. It has been laid down, we believe with perfect soundness, that promise, *cum copula*, does not constitute marriage, but may be raised into marriage by an action to declare it. In this way, though an illicit connexion, preceded by a promise, may have been terminated for years, it is marriage, or not marriage, at the pleasure of the parties; and many, we believe, have had their lives embittered by claims of this nature being suspended over them, which their holders were reluctant to prosecute, but determined not to relinquish.

A singular case illustrative of this branch of the law occurred in the Scottish Courts very lately. An individual had persuaded a lady to sign a contract of marriage with him, but no celebration followed. It was nothing therefore but a promise—and an action was raised against the lady, in which it was attempted to show, that consummation had followed. The Court found that this attempt was a complete and total failure; but they did not arrive at this result, without an investigation of the most painful and revolting kind, in which modest and respectable persons of rank and station, were subjected to inquiries of the most offensive description. Through this wearisome and disgusting labyrinth of examination, spread over many months, and extending to many hundred pages of print, had the Court to wander, before they could decide this very simple issue—whether these parties were married or not?

Nor must it be forgotten, that while, as we think we have shown, this provision of the law is no protection to the female, the hardship and injury in such cases is by no means uniformly on the side of the woman. As far as the experience of the Courts of Law is concerned, we believe it is very much the other way. Most of the cases of this description are very frequently attempts by parties of character the most abandoned, either to

* There is a well known case on record, which occurred among parties of the upper rank, where reference was made to the oath of the party. He denied the promise on oath; but on the death of his unfortunate paramour, leaving a considerable estate, he endeavoured to retract his deposition, that he might obtain it for his child.

extort money, or to gratify ambition or revenge. This law affords no protection to the virtuous female—while it holds out inducements to the designing and depraved.

The last mode of constituting marriage which we mentioned, is the most indefinite and uncertain of all. Marriage may be constituted in Scotland, by cohabitation as man and wife, taken along with the repute and opinion of the public, that the parties are married. From this the law presumes a prior matrimonial consent.

There is no branch of the marriage law of Scotland, over which so much doubt and uncertainty hangs as this. The elements which it requires are—*first*, cohabitation—by which is understood living at bed and board—and secondly, the public reputation that the parties so consorting together, were truly man and wife. Our readers may easily suppose what inextricable confusion may arise out of such elements. The simple case might not present much difficulty. If a man brings a female to his house, places her at the head of it, calls her by his name, pays her the deference and regard due to a wife, and lives with her for twenty years, with the respect and consideration of the whole neighbourhood—the law might make no great stretch in presuming that the parties were married, without putting on either the burden of proving it. But such a case is but a rare example. The usual cases that occur on this head are those where a connexion, altogether illicit in its commencement, begins, in the process of time, to wear something of the garb of matrimony—when a sense of justice—or a rising family—or the necessity for services grown indispensable—or mere female influence, induce a man to make his mistress somewhat more respectable in the eyes of the public, without absolutely making her his wife—not always without some lurking notion, that while he refuses to wear the fetters of marriage during his life, the law may interpose after his death, to disappoint the next heir of entail, or to legitimize his children. When there comes therefore to be a doubtful cohabitation, and a divided repute—which almost uniformly happens—not only is extrication difficult in the extreme, but the parties themselves may be under most reasonable and conscientious doubt whether they are married or not—the lady, whether she has succeeded in doubling the point of matrimony—the man, whether he has kept within it. They are free to part as to remain together—nor, as we think, has the law any hold on either of them, to punish a subsequent union, cemented by marriage regularly celebrated. But either is at the mercy of the other; and if rancour and revenge have arisen, as they will do, from the ashes of extinct affection, this constructive marriage may haunt either, as an ill-omened and blighting spectre, through every future

scene of comfort or ambition, and leave them only at a premature grave.

Nor is the difficulty and doubt in which the decision of such cases is involved the least part of the evil. Repute is always a vague term. What is reputed on one side the hill may be disbelieved on the other. The relations of one party may believe what those of the other as resolutely deny, and as in the well-known case of Balbougie, it may turn out that an equal number of witnesses may be found to prove that the repute of the marriage was universal, and that no such imagination ever crossed the minds of the gossips of the neighbourhood. In such cases the very servants in the house are divided into Montagues and Capulets—the marriage and the no-marriage factions. The rival tradesmen in the neighbouring village each take their side—it is the weekly subject of debate in the change-house over the hebdomadal toddy, and the country writers are looking sharp out for the expected prey. The hour comes, the laird is gathered to his fathers, a hybrid between a bachelor and a benedict. The declarator of legitimacy, as Scottish lawyers term it, is raised by the children;—the next heir treats them of course as illegitimate—and then comes the tug of witnesses and war. Repute is the question, and no railway committee ever were indulged with more hopeless antagonism of evidence than may be looked for in such a cause. When the tattle and prurient gossip of the countryside has been reduced into a focus, in the shape of some gigantic quarto volume, the labour of the judge begins; probably, as in the last case of note under this head that was tried, “occupying a week of the time of the Court, the discussion having lasted forty-two hours.” From this fearful mass the judge is to distil the legal inference of “married or not,” the result being probably that it is marriage in the Outer House, no marriage in the Inner House, and marriage again in the House of Lords. Surely this is to desecrate the purest and holiest institution which the law has to protect.

Such is a cursory, but still, we think, an accurate outline of the modes by which marriage may be constituted in Scotland. It is plain enough that to institute a Register of Marriages, while the law so continued, was altogether out of the question; and the alternative necessarily was to abandon the idea of registration, or to alter the law. The question which the public of Scotland have to consider is—Are there any such advantages in the system we have now described that should render it desirable to have that system perpetuated, at the social sacrifices at which it must be purchased?

Notwithstanding all we have said, we do think the system, as it is, preferable to one where the impediments thrown in the

way of marriage amount, in many cases, to an absolute prohibition. Such a system we take to be not only a direct violation of natural right, but destructive of national morality. If the present Bill of the Lord Advocate had introduced what could be considered a limitation of the *power* to marry, either in point of age or otherwise, we should have thought the whole subject one involving much deeper and graver doubts. But such is not, in the least degree, the nature of the proposed change. It in substance deals with the evidence of marriage only, and leaves all as free to marry as before, provided the evidence of the contract is recorded. As the Bill itself has one merit over most modern pieces of legislation, that, namely, of brevity, we give it entire, as amended in Committee during last Parliament.

“WHEREAS it is expedient that the Law of Marriage in Scotland should be amended as far as the same affects the Constitution of Marriage in that country; Be it Enacted, by The QUEEN’S most Excellent MAJESTY, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the Authority of the same, THAT from and after the Last day of March One thousand eight hundred and Forty-eight, excepting in the case of Jews and Quakers, as hereinafter excepted, no Marriage shall be contracted in Scotland otherwise than by solemnization in presence of a Clergyman, or by registration, in terms of an Act passed in the present Session of Parliament, intituled, “An Act for registering Births, Deaths, and Marriages in Scotland;” the parties proposing to marry by registration appearing in presence of the Registrar, and then and there signing before witnesses the entry of their Marriage in the register, and having the same otherwise registered in the manner provided by the said Act, in the case of the registration of Marriages by the parties themselves contracting Marriage; upon and by which registration only the Marriage shall be held to be contracted or valid or effectual to any effect or purpose whatever.

“And be it Enacted, That it shall be lawful for the Registrar to register any Marriage in the following cases only, and in none other; first, if the Marriage shall be solemnized in presence of a Clergyman, and registered at the time; or, secondly, if there shall be produced to the Registrar a certificate under the hands of a Clergyman solemnizing the Marriage, that the Marriage was solemnized in his presence, and in the event of such Clergyman not being either the Minister of the parish forming or contained in the district in which such Marriage is to be registered, or usually officiating in some known congregation within such parish, the Registrar before registration shall require the subscription of such Clergyman to such certificate to be attested by the Superintendent Registrar of the district, or the Registrar of the sub-district in which such Clergyman resides or so officiates; or, thirdly, if the contracting parties, one or both of them, being of the Jewish religion, have solemnized their Marriage according to the rites

observed by persons professing the Jewish religion, or, being a Quaker or Quakers, have solemnized their Marriage according to the forms or usages observed by persons belonging to the Society of Friends commonly called Quakers, and such Marriage between persons of the Jewish religion shall be certified to the Registrar by the Secretary of the synagogue to which the husband contracting such Marriage shall belong, to have been performed according to such rites, and such Marriage between persons belonging to the Society of Friends shall be certified to the Registrar by the registering officer of the Society to which such persons belong to have been duly performed according to the forms or usages of such Society; or, fourthly, if both, or one at least of the parties intending to contract Marriage shall have been resident within the district for Twenty clear Days previous to the date of registration, and notice shall have been given to the Registrar of such district of their intention to register such Marriage, Ten clear Days previous to the registration, such notice, stating the Christian names and surnames, and designations or additions and residences of the contracting parties, and in such last case the Registrar receiving such notice shall, within the space of Twenty-four Hours, give notice to the Registrar of the district in which the other contracting party, if resident in another district, shall reside, who shall forthwith ascertain and report to such first-mentioned Registrar whether the statement in such notice be correct; and if it shall appear and be notified that the statement is incorrect, the registration shall not take place; and such notices shall be published in the district, or in both districts (as the case may be), by affixing a copy thereof upon the doors of the parish church, in the same manner as other statutory notices are published, or on some conspicuous place on or near the door or window of the Post-office of the district: Provided always, That it shall be lawful to the Registrar-general, with the approbation of one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, to direct such other or additional publication of such notices to be made or given as to him shall seem necessary or proper.

“ Provided always, and be it Enacted, That if any party shall knowingly and wilfully do in the contrary of what is hereinbefore enacted, by signing, either as one of the contracting parties, or as Registrar, any Register of Marriage, excepting in one or other of the cases hereinbefore specified, such party or Registrar shall be held guilty of an offence, and be punished by fine, not exceeding Two Hundred Pounds, or by imprisonment, for any period not exceeding One Year, provided that the Register shall not be thereby affected, but the registration shall be to all intents and purposes valid and effectual.

“ And be it Enacted, That where any Registrar shall receive notice of the intention to register a Marriage, he shall be bound, if required by either of the parties to such intended Marriage who shall be resident in his district, to certify, in such form as the Registrar-general shall direct, that such notice has been given; and any Clergyman to whom such certificate shall be produced by such party shall, on the expiration of Ten Days from the date of such notice, be entitled to solemnize Marriage between the parties stated in such notice as

intending to contract Marriage without any certificate of banns, and whether proclamation of banns shall have been made or not, and neither he nor the parties to such Marriage so solemnized shall be liable to any civil pains and penalties in respect of solemnizing such Marriage without proclamation of banns.

“ Provided always, and be it Enacted, That no marriage shall be solemnized in presence of a Clergyman unless both, or one at least, of the contracting parties shall have been resident within the parish in which the Marriage is solemnized Twenty clear Days before the solemnization of such Marriage; and if any Clergyman or any party shall knowingly and wilfully do in the contrary, he shall be guilty of an offence, and be punished by fine, not exceeding Two Hundred Pounds, or by imprisonment, for any period not exceeding One Year, but the validity of the Marriage shall not be affected.

“ Provided always, and be it Enacted, That nothing herein contained shall affect or be held or construed to affect the validity of any Marriage where the Marriage has been solemnized in presence of a Clergyman, or of a party professing to be and acting as, and believed to be a Clergyman, or, in the case of Jews, has been solemnized according to the rites observed by persons professing the Jewish religion, or, in the case of Quakers, according to the rites or form observed by persons belonging to the Society of Friends commonly called Quakers.

“ And be it Enacted and Declared, That the registration of Marriage by the parties themselves contracting the Marriage shall of itself in all cases constitute Marriage; and such parties shall thereafter be held and deemed to be married persons to all effects and purposes whatever.

“ Provided always, and be it Enacted, That if any person not authorized to solemnize Marriage by the laws of the Established Church, or the laws or practice of any communion to which he may belong, shall profess to be and act as a Clergyman in the solemnization of any Marriage, he shall be guilty of an offence, and be punishable by imprisonment not exceeding the period of Two Years.

“ And be it Enacted, That the word ‘Clergyman’ shall include all Clergymen or Ministers of religion authorized to solemnize Marriage by the laws of the Church, or rules and practice of the communion to which he belongs, whether belonging to the Established Church or to any other Church, or to any sect or persuasion, by whatever name or denomination known.

“ And be it Enacted, That this Act may be amended or repealed by any Act to be passed during the present Session of Parliament.”

Such is the proposed measure. It will be observed, in the first place, that it does not interfere in any way whatever with marriages solemnized by a clergyman; these are left altogether unaffected by its provisions, with this exception, that, under certain circumstances, the penalties on clergymen for celebrating marriages without proclamation of banns, is taken off by sect. 4.

Secondly, It neither creates nor legalizes any *new form* of constituting marriage. The signature of the Registrar, before two witnesses, as required by the Registration Act, would constitute marriage by the law of Scotland as it stands, as the detail which has been given already sufficiently shows. Its object and effect is to prevent any irregular marriages, not celebrated by a clergyman, from being valid in law, *excepting* when registered in terms of the Act.

On the details of the measure, there is, of course, room for doubt and criticism; and on these, before concluding, we may hazard one or two remarks. But we think the mere statement of the measure itself, contrasted with the state of the law which it is meant to remedy, quite enough to sweep away at a brush the loud and absurd cavils with which its first introduction was received. The objectors were of two classes—those who complained of the bill for giving license in marriage, and those who grumbled at it for restricting and restraining it. They could hardly both be right. We think they were both in the wrong. The first, egregiously, ignorantly, and barely honestly. The second class, perhaps, with more show of reason.

Of the attempt which was made to stir up the strong religious feelings of our countrymen, by representing this measure as if for the first time in Scotland it legalized marriages not celebrated by the Church, we hardly know how to speak with sufficient temper. Either the ignorance of these critics was so gross, or their dishonesty so transparent, as in either case to justify much stronger language than befits the moderation of our pages. What is law in Scotland now, our readers have seen already; we have shewn clearly enough that the law permits and sanctions marriages far less respectable, and certainly not in the least more religious, than the signature of a Registrar. Nor does it make the slightest difference whether the law by which these marriages are at present sanctioned, be statute law, or the common law of Scotland. In both cases equally, the broad shield of civil sanction is thrown over them, and the nation is as responsible for the laws which the decisions of judges have confirmed, as for those which statute has enacted.

But the conclusive answer to complaints on this head will be found in what we indicated already, that it required no Act of Parliament to *legalize* such marriages as those constituted by signature of the Registrar. They are legal as the law now stands; the authority of Parliament was only required to deprive the other modes already explained of the legality which they at present enjoy.

But then it is urged, that although these irregular marriages are strictly speaking legal at present, they are discouraged and

discountenanced by the law, and subject the parties to penalties as being clandestine; while this Bill, on the other hand, exalts them not only into legality, but into respectability, and places a marriage by Register as high as a marriage by a clergyman.

It would be quite enough to answer this objection, by the remark, that legislation should deal with realities, not with legal phantoms or shadows. Nothing this Bill, though it were passed into a law, could do or effect, would make marriage by Register reputable. No man of respectability, and no woman of modesty, will ever prefer such a mode of constituting the ceremony, merely because all other kinds of irregular marriages are prohibited. As to the discouragement of the Law, we do not know the meaning of the term, unless the Law either prohibits or punishes. It is only in her dotage that Justice frowns, and threatens, without commanding and enforcing. If irregular marriages are neither prohibited nor punished as the Law now stands, it is mere drivelling to babble about the discouragement of the Law. That they are not prohibited, we have seen. Are they punished? How many Gretna Green delinquents have been criminally prosecuted? How many of the hundreds of couples married year after year by the Lanarkshire Justice? Or is it not an undeniable and unquestionable fact, that not only within this century, or the last century, but in the whole history of the Law of Scotland, since the Reformation, there is not one single example of any party whatever being criminally punished for such irregular marriages as it is the object of this Bill to prevent. Even, therefore, were it the case that the Statute Book contained some empty condemnation—some ineffectual thunder launched forth against such marriages, better have it extinguished at once than remain to be daily spurned at and contemned.

But there is the best of all reasons for the fact, that no prosecution was ever known to be instituted for irregular marriages of the description in question, and that is, that the statutory enactments which are supposed to strike at clandestine marriages, do not include—or at least are certainly not directed against—the kind of marriage we are considering. They relate to cases where the *religious ceremony* has been irregularly performed; and in the opinion of the Lord Advocate—certainly by universal consent the highest legal authority at the bar of Scotland—they extend to that case only. The view he takes of it is the following:—

“ By an Act passed in 1661, and another in 1695, clergymen were prevented, under pains and penalties, from celebrating marriage. Under these Acts the Episcopal clergy first assailed the Presbyterian clergy; the latter, when they got the upper hand, used the Acts

against the Episcopalian and Roman Catholic clergy. These last, with the exception of an Act passed in favour of the Episcopal clergy, continued subject to these disabilities down to 1833 or 1834, when an Act was passed allowing clergymen of all persuasions to celebrate marriage, only there must be a proclamation of the banns. In Scotland, however, the proclamation of the banns is read by the session clerk in an inaudible voice, before the service begins, and when very few persons are present to hear them, and all this not on three consecutive Sundays, but on the same day; and it often happened that the banns were proclaimed in a church not attended by the parties, or their friends, or acquaintances. If, however, the session clerk gave a certificate that the banns were duly proclaimed, you could make no further inquiry. It was said that the statute law discouraged all marriages not made in presence of a clergyman, and countenanced those only where a religious ceremony was performed. But how stood the fact? If you do not resort to the clergyman—if you leave him entirely out, and make a simple declaration before witnesses, you are subject to no pains and penalties; but if you should resort to a clergyman, or employ a religious ceremony—if you read at your marriage the ritual of the Church of England or the Church of Rome—if you go through any form of celebrating a marriage—but have not got your proclamation of banns, the celebrator of that marriage, though unquestionably a clergyman, is liable to a prosecution. The only chance of a prosecution in the matter was, when a religious ceremony was used; if the marriage was without religious ceremony, the statute law of Scotland imposed no penalty. Now, in the Bill before the House, he did not propose to affect any marriage celebrated in a place of worship. He was quite content that the clergy of the Church of Scotland, Roman Catholics, and all Dissenters, should celebrate marriages as they had been heretofore accustomed. But the Bill required that when the parties did not choose to be married by a clergyman, they should be married before the Registrar; and where the marriage was to be so contracted, provision was made for much greater publicity than was or could be obtained by proclamation of banns."

It would be wearisome to our readers, and thoroughly unprofitable, as well as flat and stale, to enter into an argument, such as the mere lawyer delights in—whether there is or is not ground for holding that these statutes do include marriage constituted by declaration, promise, or cohabitation? Probably our readers in general will be quite satisfied with the undisputed fact, that they have never been so applied—and while there are few such points for which juridical ingenuity will not make a stout fight in theory, he would be a bold lawyer who would advise a prosecution on any one of them. But we can have no doubt that the Lord Advocate is right in his reading of the statutes themselves, as well as fortified by that surest exponent of statutes, constant and invariable practice,

The Act 1661 was passed during the interregnum between Presbyterianism and Episcopacy. The object of it unquestionably was to prevent the *celebration*, that is, the religious celebration of marriage, either in a "disorderly" or irregular way, by qualified clergymen, or by those not being qualified, such as Jesuits, priests, deposed or suspended ministers, &c. It sets out by declaring the necessity of no marriage being *celebrated* "but according to the laudable order and constitution of the Kirk, and by such persons as are by the authority of this Kirk warranted to *celebrate* the same;" and it proceeds to "statute and ordain that whatsoever person or persons shall hereafter marry, or procure themselves to be married, in a *clandestine and in orderly way*, or by Jesuits, priests, &c., shall be imprisoned for three months," &c. There are, it is true, some general words in this Act, which, superficially read, might be supposed to include the modes of marriage we have been considering. But the slightest attention to the statute makes it evident that the offence which it was the object of this statute to prevent, was the performance of the *religious ceremony* in a disorderly way, or by unauthorized hands. Accordingly, it is assumed throughout that all the marriages alluded to in the Act are "*celebrated*"—have a "*celebrator*"—which celebrator is to be visited with the most condign and summary punishment—to be banished the kingdom, on pain of death, if he return. There is plainly no allusion here to the purely civil modes of constituting the contract, which have no "celebration," and in which no functions of the Church are usurped. And, accordingly, it is against the celebrator alone, as Baron Hume tells us, that the darts of criminal law have ever been launched, though the statement is rather too broadly made. Rival ecclesiastics used the provisions of the statute against each other—the Prelates of the Restoration against the Covenanters of the Commonwealth, and the Presbyterians of the Revolution, in their turn, against the Nonjurors and Nonconformists of those days. But when no ecclesiastic intervened, no ceremony was performed, and no religious rite was solemnized; then the marriage was not celebrated in the sense of the statute. The question was, in fact, practically decided in a case tried in Circuit at Dumfries, before Lord Gillies, in 1830. Mr. Alison mentions the circumstances as follows:—

"This man, who was a publican at Annan, was charged with celebrating three different clandestine marriages at that place. On the proof, it appeared that in all the instances, the couples came into his presence, and upon his interrogatory, confessed themselves to be married persons, upon which he declared them married, and wrote out a certificate, which he delivered to the woman, signed by himself and two witnesses, setting forth the fact, and declaring that they were

married. The matrimonial consent was interchanged *de presenti* in his presence, but without any prayer or religious ceremony whatever. On this *species facti*, the Court directed the Jury to bring in a verdict of not proven, which was accordingly done, *upon the ground that this was not celebrating a marriage, in the sense of the statutes, which implied the assumption of some part of the ecclesiastical character.*"

Though this was only a Circuit decision, and not therefore so high in authority as one pronounced in the High Court, the notoriety of such practices, and their present impunity, have sufficiently confirmed the judgment.

The only instances of which we are aware in which fines have been imposed on marriages constituted without celebration, afford a diverting commentary on the "discouragements" of the law. They are cases where the imposition of the fine is made of itself to constitute the marriage. The marriage is "celebrated" as follows:—Some one in collusion with the intending spouses—such at least was, till recently, a very common proceeding—presents a petition to the Magistrates of a burgh, stating that A. B. and C. D. have contracted an irregular marriage, and praying for fine and imprisonment. Thereupon, bridegroom and bride, according to Scottish phrase, "emit a declaration" confessing the offence, and submitting to punishment, on which the Bailie fines them; and the extract of this judgment is their marriage certificate! The grim and slipshod goddess of Justice who presides over Burgh Courts is thus made herself to officiate as bride's-maid, and consecrate the nuptial couch.

The Act of 1672, c. 9, regulating ordination, provided that "whosoever shall be married within this kingdom by the fore-said persons, (*i. e.* not ordained according to law,) or by any other person not lawfully authorized, they shall amit and lose any right or interest they may have by that marriage *jure mariti vel jure relicto*," &c. Thus, there can be no doubt that the penalty was applicable only to the irregular celebration of the religious ceremony. But this Act was totally swept away by 1690, c. 27.

The Act 1690, c. 27, prohibited all "outed ministers," that is, the Episcopalian clergy, from performing the ceremonies of baptism or marriage—and confirmed the Act of 1661 in other respects. This Act was, however, repealed by 10 Anne, c. 7, by which, on certain conditions, the Episcopalian clergy were permitted to baptize and marry. But their disabilities were not wholly removed till the passing of 32 Geo. III., c. 63, in 1792.

By the 4 and 5 Wil. IV., c. 28, clergymen of all denominations were authorized to perform the ceremony of marriage, provided banns had been duly proclaimed; and the Act 1661 stands expressly repeated, even as regards the "celebrations," against

which it was directed, in all cases where such celebration was by a clergyman—excepting where banns have been duly proclaimed.

The discouragement, therefore, which the law gives to clandestine marriages, amounts to no more than this, that if no religious ceremony intervenes, a marriage constituted by declaration, promise *cum copula*, or cohabitation, is valid in itself, and subjects the parties in no penalty whatever—and that even where a religious ceremony is performed, all that it requires is, that the celebration should be in orders, and that the banns shall have been duly proclaimed.

It was hardly worth our while to have wasted so many words on this *labor ineptiarum*. If the result of our inquiry had been the other way, it would not have weighed three grains in the balance—nor is it of the slightest consequence practically, whether penalties, which are never enforced, lurk in the corners of an Act of Parliament or not. It is quite certain in effect, that the law neither prevents nor punishes marriages of this nature—and that this Bill only declares to be legal in part, under certain limiting conditions, unions which, under the present law are altogether and unconditionally valid.

But we own we find in this measure no favour shown to the proposed marriage by registration. Its operation is one which limits instead of extending the sanction which the law gives them already; and if the law, as it stands, disapproves while it permits, we see nothing in the measure before us which in any degree lessens that disapprobation. With marriages by a clergyman the Bill does not interfere in any shape or way, and excepting in regard to proclamation of banns, the law in that respect stands just as it did. After the exposition we have given, we need say nothing further to demonstrate that the idea that this Bill is in any respect latitudinarian or lax—that, as some orators would persuade the country, it is likely to upset the religious ceremony of marriage, and to open the floodgates of immorality on our land, is a mere delusion, having its origin in profound ignorance either of the law as it stands, or of the provisions of the proposed measure, or probably of both, and capable of misleading no one who has the slightest desire to consider the subject candidly, with a view to the social benefit of the public.

One word, before leaving this class of objections, in regard to the proclamation of banns. There is only one object in such proclamation, and that is, not, as is commonly supposed, to give fees to the Session Clerk, but to give publicity to the intended marriage, in order that any having interest may object. The practice of proclaiming banns was one derived from the Roman

Catholic Church ; and in so far as it effected the object of giving publicity to the marriage, in time to allow of improper marriages being prevented, it was a wholesome and salutary institution. But there is no particular virtue in the utterance of the announcement of the marriage by the Session Clerk—still less, in his mumbling over the same announcement three times in one day—and still less in his giving a certificate thereafter that such announcement had been made on three separate Sabbaths. That such is the present practice is notorious. The certificate of the Session Clerk is conclusive, and the officiating clergyman is both entitled and bound to proceed upon it ; and if the Session Clerk's conscience is easily satisfied, which it very often is in such cases, the certificate is granted that full proclamation had been made on three separate days, while it had, in fact, only been three times muttered over on one Sunday morning.

Now, whatever decency and propriety there may be (and none can maintain that there is more strenuously than we do) in having the marriage ceremony uniformly performed by a clergyman, we are not in the least disposed to carry down the sanctity to the Session Clerk and his proclamations of the banns. That is a purely secular duty, and one which is much too secularly performed. It is only of use in so far as it answers its object of giving public notice of the intended union, and has no other efficacy or charm whatever. Now, this Bill provides that when the Registering Officer shall have received due notice of an intended marriage, (which must be given ten days before,) an intimation to that effect shall be affixed on the church doors, and also publicly on some part of his office, for such period of ten days ; and that if the Registering Officer shall grant a certificate that such notice has been given, it shall be lawful for a clergyman to marry, without proclamation of banns,—most reasonably so,—because the object of publicity has been far more successfully attained. The proclamation in church may be heard by no one—as it often is ; those who do hear it may not listen to it—may know nothing of the parties—or may straightway forget that they ever did hear it : whereas the public notification on the doors of the church and of the office may be read every day of the week by every passer-by. The proclamation of banns is not abolished or interfered with ; it is only not to be the exclusive test of publicity, and we are at a loss to conceive the slightest reason why it should be.

We have now disposed, we think conclusively, of by far the most vociferous, and eminently the most unreasonable and absurd class of adversaries, which this Bill has encountered. We think we have shown that, viewed in any light, it is not its laxity or license, which can with any justice or sense be objected to it.

The other class of objectors, however—those namely, who consider it as too stringent or restrictive, unquestionably raise some very important principles, of wide application, and material influence on society. We do not in the least disguise that there are considerations on this branch of the subject, which are not to be lightly laid aside, and deserve to be maturely weighed and digested.

It is maintained that the ease and freedom of marriage under our present law, has a direct tendency to morality—that it prevents the awful evils of seduction, and gives the female a protection and security, which under a more strict marriage law she does not possess. It is farther said that by limiting parties either to marriage after proclamation of banns, or to marriage by registration, that protection is in a great degree, if not altogether destroyed.

There is no doubt that impediments to marriage do produce this result. We should much object to see the English Marriage Act fastened on this country; being quite satisfied that to prevent the marriage of adults by prohibition is in the highest degree injurious to social morality. It may perhaps be true also that the facility of marriage in Scotland has produced, or rather co-existed with a higher standard of purity than the restrictions on it in the sister kingdom. But even if it were true that it is less dangerous, in a social point of view, to sacrifice the certainty of marriage to the facility of contracting it, than it is to make the evidence of it certain by restraining and restricting the right to contract, it certainly does not follow that there is any charm or virtue in the vague and indefinite system which now prevails. We are inclined to think that system far more unfavourable to female virtue than that under which the present Bill would place this country; and we shall explain very shortly why we think so.

It cannot be denied that every difficulty in establishing the fact of marriage, when it has been truly contracted, operates against the weaker sex, and in favour of the party who has dishonourable designs. This might be illustrated in all the different modes of constituting the contract to which we have referred. In the case of marriage by declaration, we have already put the case of the loss or abstraction of the written document, to the faith of which a woman may have trusted her honour. Nor is this a rare or fanciful example. Any one conversant with such questions knows that it is one which occurs only too frequently, and the fraud being one which in the circumstances in which the parties are placed is so easily perpetrated, the legal efficacy attached to an occult and unknown document, is more likely to be a snare than a protection to virtue. Nor is a declaration,

made privately, before witnesses, more secure. The witnesses may die, may be false, may be hired for the purpose, or bribed at the trial; in short, the wife's honour hangs on the thin and tremulous thread of the testimony of two frail, forgetful, and fallible mortals.

Of marriage by promise, *subsequente copula*, we do not think that, practically, the effects at all differ. If it were possible to prove a promise, in all cases where it is made, the provision of the law would be just and humane. But, as we have remarked already, this, from the very nature of the case, is impossible. The woman who deliberately proposes to contract marriage in this way cannot be said to be seduced, if she preserves evidence of the promise. It then becomes as deliberate a contract as an entry in a register. But the real case for which the law is meant to provide, is *seduction* under promise of marriage—where the female does not rely on a marriage so constituted, but trusts to the honour of the man to celebrate the ceremony. But does not this ruin a hundred for one it saves? If the man be trustworthy, and regards his plighted word, he will fulfil it as the law allows. If he be false, he will not only not keep his promise, but he will deny it.

The law of cohabitation and repute can hardly be pleaded as in favour of the female. That law presumes that both parties really intended marriage in the face of the public, although the evidence of the ceremony had been lost or forgotten. If it were known law that no marriage was valid without registration, or celebration by a clergyman, there would then be no room for any such presumption of fact, where neither party took the only means of carrying the supposed intention into effect.

It appears to us, on the other hand, that there can be no greater safeguard of female virtue, no more effectual preventive of fraud, than a marriage law which makes the evidence of the contract certain, and affords all facilities at the same time for the constitution of it. If in the confidence of affection, or the ardour of passion, mere trust in the promise of a lover is sufficient to stifle the voice of virtue, no law, we fear, can control or prevent the evil. But at any rate, the female in such a case will not be deceived. She will not imagine that the law invests her, though unknown to the world, with the sanctity and warrants of the conjugal character. Even in her own eyes she must see herself as she is. Nor can she weave vain dreams of respectability or honour under the protection of unavailing law. On the other hand, as long as the dictates of virtue and reason maintain their ascendancy, what can be more important for the female, than a law clear, certain, and definite. All sophistry or pretence would be vain to persuade her that the union was sanctioned by law.

if it were notorious that so simple a provision as that of signing the Registrar's Book was the only means by which a celebration by a clergyman could be dispensed with.

This, however, leads us to remark, that there is one part of the proposed measure on which there is strong room for doubt. We shall state the grounds for hesitation which have occurred to ourselves, as we consider the subject one on which the public should have all views presented to them, without giving any decided opinion on which side expediency may predominate.

The doubt to which we refer relates to the provisions respecting notice of marriage by registration; and as the question goes deep into the principle on which the bill proceeds, it is right that it should be deliberately considered.

We see no reason to object to the provision, that the notice provided by the statute should be given—nor to the farther provision, that such notice shall stand as an equivalent for the proclamation of banns. But we think there is reason to doubt, whether this notice should be indispensable to the registration of a marriage. As the Bill stands at present, the Registrar is prohibited from registering any marriage in which the notice shall not have been duly given—under a statutory penalty; although the marriage, if registered, is valid. The result of this practically will be, that the Registrar will obey the law, and that legal marriage without such notice will be made impossible. We should rather be inclined to reverse the order; to permit marriage by registration without notice, but to affix a penalty for such marriage on the parties. Our reason for this suggestion, flows naturally from the views we have enforced above. Consent of parties being the foundation of marriage—impediments to marriage being pernicious, and the necessity of legislation truly arising from the lubricity and uncertainty of the requisite evidence of the contract, we do not see any valid reason why consent expressed before the Registrar, and duly recorded in his public volume before witnesses, should not stand good. To require, as an essential, that ten days' notice shall be given, and that otherwise no consent, however deliberately given, or legally testified, shall constitute the contract, is, we think, to create a condition foreign to the essence of the contract itself, and a far greater infringement of the principle of the Marriage law than the object of the Bill requires. A little attention, also, to the necessary practical results of this provision will increase the doubts of its expediency. It leads to this, that a hurried or private marriage is impossible. A clergyman cannot legally, and, if he is a respectable man, will not, celebrate marriage without proclamation of banns, and, under this Bill, without ten days' notice, of the most public and almost degrading

description, the Register is shut. Now, we quite concur in thinking that the Legislature should afford no facilities to latent or private marriages; on the contrary, perhaps the present measure would be improved by some more specific disapproval of all irregular marriages not celebrated by a clergyman. But the great object of certainty being attained, we think the prohibitions of law should cease. There are in society many, too many, cases where a private marriage is absolutely beneficial. It happens every day that a man is willing to do what has become an act of justice, and ready to face the sneers of the world, or the frowns of relations, when it is done, who yet would shrink with invincible disgust from being advertised for ten days on the walls of a public office. If he has promised marriage, the signature of the Registrar affords an immediate, easy, and certain mode of fulfilling his promise: but if all the neighbourhood is to resound with the fame of it for ten days—if his *mésalliance* is to be theme of gossip at kirk and market, he is exposed to the importunities of friends, the impertinence of the unfriendly, and the misgivings of his own wavering constancy. This is but one instance. Our readers may easily imagine others. We think it desirable, for public morality, that it should be possible to celebrate marriage without notoriety or publicity, provided the certainty of the constitution of it is not impaired. We think this object might be obtained, either by simply rendering marriage by signature of the Registrar legal, while a penalty is affixed wherever the requisite notice is dispensed with, or by a provision for obtaining something of the nature of a special license, on payment of a penalty, to be granted at the discretion of the Superintendent Registrar of the district, by which a certain check would be placed on the abuse of the privilege.

The same reasons do not apply to the provision in regard to the previous residence of the parties within the district. On the contrary, it seems very necessary to prevent the sudden irruption of a couple into the district of the Registrar, for no purpose but that of marriage—and for this reason, among others, that if parties resident at a distance, and utterly unknown to the neighbourhood before or afterwards, were entitled to use the Register, the benefit of its publicity would be, to a great extent, neutralized, and it would not afford the necessary protection against double marriages.

We had intended to close these remarks by an account of the proposed system of Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages, and the machinery contemplated by the statute. But our limits are already exhausted. We shall only observe in leaving the subject, that we hope that both the details and the principles of these measures will be extensively and thoroughly canvassed. There may

perhaps be various points of expression, arrangement, or enactment, in which they admit of improvement. We are not without the hope that our next County Meetings, and General Assemblies, will be found quietly canvassing the details of a great national question, with a single and patriotic desire for the social welfare of the people, unterrified by the shadows of coming assessments, or the bugbear of the imagined influence of dissent. It is a subject on which both classes are well entitled to be heard, and to have their deliberate and temperate opinions considered with attention and respect. But if they sink the influence they should possess, in unreasoning and ignorant clamour, they cannot wonder, if stranded by the passing current of public opinion and enlightened legislation, they find their remonstrances fall unheeded on the wearied ears of public men, and their narrow conceptions turned into weapons against them, by those who wish their downfall.

ART. IX.—*Results of Astronomical Observations made during the years 1834, 5, 6, 7, 8, at the Cape of Good Hope, being the completion of a Telescopic Survey of the whole surface of the visible Heavens, commenced in 1825.* By Sir JOHN HERSCHEL, Bart., K.H., D.C.L., F.R.S. London and Edinburgh.

IN the history of Astronomical Discovery there shine no brighter names than those of Sir William and Sir John Herschel—the father and the son. It is rare that the intellectual mantle of the parent lights upon the child. By no culture, however skilful, and no anxieties, however earnest, can we transmit to our successors the qualities or the capacities of the mind. The eagle eye, the active limb, the giant frame, and the “form divine,”—the gifts of our mortal being, are frequently conveyed by natural descent, and may be numbered even among the rights of primogeniture; but the higher developments of reason and fancy, the bright coruscations of the soul, have never been ranked among the claims or the accidents of birth. The gifts of fortune which we inherit or acquire, have been placed more immediately at our disposal, and in many cases have been handed down unimpaired to distant generations; but Providence has reserved for its own distribution, those transcendental powers which give omnipotence to genius, and constitute its possessor the high priest of nature, or the vicegerent of Heaven. In a destiny so lofty, the father and the son have been rarely associated; and in the very few cases in which a joint commission has been issued to them, it has generally been to work in different spheres, or at different levels. In the universe of mind, the phenomenon of a double star is more rare than its prototype in the firmament, and when it does appear we watch its phases and its mutations with a corresponding interest. The case of the two Herschels is a remarkable one, and may appear an exception to our general law. The father, however, was not called to the survey of the heavens, till he had passed the middle period of life, and it was but a just arrangement, that the son in his youth and manhood, should continue and complete the labours of his sire. The records of Astronomy do not emblazon a more glorious day than that, in which the semidiurnal arc of the father was succeeded by the semidiurnal arc of the son. No sooner had the evening luminary disappeared amid the gorgeous magnificence of the west, than the morning star arose, bright and cloudless in its appointed course.

It has long been a subject of regret to the astronomical world,

that in our language no extended account has yet been published of the life and discoveries of Sir William Herschel. With the exception of a short Biographical Memoir,* and a popular abstract of his astronomical observations on the nebulae and double stars, and on the bodies of our own system,† no suitable account of his labours has appeared even in our larger treatises on astronomy, and general readers have, therefore, no adequate idea of the value and extent of his discoveries.‡ Though his scientific studies did not, as we have already stated, commence till he had reached the middle period of life, yet he pursued them, under difficulties of no ordinary kind, with all the ardour of youthful devotion, and with that dauntless and indefatigable perseverance, which never fails of success. Every step indeed of his astronomical career was marked with discoveries equally interesting and unexpected. New planets and new satellites, were successively added to our own solar system. Thousands of nebulae and double stars were discovered in the sidereal firmament, and in those remote regions of space where the imagination had hitherto scarcely dared to wander, and where the stars in countless multitudes seemed to be fixed in absolute immobility, the physical astronomer was directed to new systems of worlds,—binary, ternary, and multiple,—exhibiting the general phenomena of annual and diurnal rotation, and rendering it probable that the law of gravitation extended to the remotest corners of space. His invention of instruments, and of new methods of observation, was no less surprising than the wonders which they disclosed. Obstacles that other men had found insuperable he speedily surmounted. The telescope which Galileo held in his hand as a toy, became under Sir William Herschel's direction a stupendous machine, which supported the astronomer himself, and even his friends, and which mechanical power was requisite even to move. There was in short no continuity between his inventions and discoveries, and those of preceding astronomers. He ventured upon a flight which left them at an immeasurable distance, and he penetrated into regions where the ablest of his successors have had some difficulty in following him.

As "the telescopic survey of the whole surface of the sidereal heavens," contained in the great work of Sir John Herschel, which is now before us, is a continuation and completion of the labours of his father, we shall endeavour to give our readers a

* *Edinburgh Philosophical Journal*, April, 1823, vol. viii. pp. 209-226.

† *Edinburgh Encyclopædia*, Art. *Astronomy*.

‡ A very interesting and valuable account of the Life and Works of Sir W. Herschel, by M. Arago, was published in the *Annuaire* for 1842. It contains a full and critical analysis of his discoveries, and is distinguished by the eloquence and learning which characterize the writings of that illustrious philosopher.

brief and general account of the discoveries of Sir William, interspersed with a few notices of the principal events of his life.

Sir William Herschel was born in the city of Hanover on the 15th November 1738. His father, who was a professor of music, educated his five sons in the same art ; but William, who was the second, after exercising his profession for about five years, in Hanover, resolved to push his fortune in England, where he arrived about the end of the year 1759. Although he was enthusiastically devoted to his profession, and pursued it with such success, as to draw from it an income considerably above his wants, his ardent mind was occasionally devoted to still higher objects. When he was resident at Halifax he acquired, by his own application, a considerable knowledge of mathematics, and having studied astronomy and optics, in the popular writings of Ferguson, he was anxious to witness with his own eyes the wonders of the planetary system. Having received from a friend the loan of a telescope, two feet in focal length, he directed it to the heavens, and was so delighted with the actual sight of phenomena, which he had previously known only from books, that he commissioned a friend to purchase for him in London a telescope with a high magnifying power. Fortunately for science, the price of such an instrument greatly exceeded his means, and he immediately resolved to construct a telescope with his own hands. After encountering the difficulties which every amateur at first experiences in the casting, grinding, and polishing of metallic specula for reflecting telescopes, he completed in 1776 a reflecting instrument, *five feet* in focal length, with which he was able to observe the ring of Saturn and the satellites and belts of Jupiter. This telescope was completed when he resided at Bath, where he acquired by degrees, and at his leisure hours, that practical knowledge of optics and mechanics which was necessary for such a task.^b His experience in this scientific art was of the most remarkable kind. He had constructed for himself several two-feet, five-feet, seven-feet, ten-feet, and twenty-feet Newtonian telescopes, besides others of the Gregorian form of eight-inches, twelve-inches, two-feet, three-feet, five-feet, and ten-feet focal length. His way of executing these instruments, at this time, when the direct method, of giving the figure of any one of the conic sections to specula, was yet unknown to him, was to cast many mirrors of each sort, to grind and polish them as accurately as he could, and then, after selecting and preserving the best of them for use, he put the rest aside to be repolished. In this way he executed no fewer than *two hundred* specula, seven feet in focal length, *one hundred and fifty*, ten feet in focal length, and about *eighty* twenty feet in focal length, besides a great num-

ber of specula of the Gregorian form, and of the construction of Dr. Smith's reflecting microscope. His mechanical labours were contemporaneous with his optical ones. He invented a great number of stands for these telescopes, contriving and delineating them of different forms, and executing the most promising of the designs. "To these labours," he himself informs us, we "owe my seven-feet Newtonian telescope stand, which was brought to its present convenient construction about seventeen years ago (in 1778,) a description and engraving of which I intend to take some future opportunity of presenting to the Royal Society. In the year 1781, I began also to construct a thirty-feet aerial reflector, and after having invented and executed a stand for it, I cast the mirror which was moulded up so as to come out thirty-six inches in diameter. The composition of my metal being a little too brittle, it cracked in the cooling. I cast it a second time, but here the furnace which I had built in my house for the purpose gave way, and the metal ran into the fire."*

Furnished with instruments so numerous and powerful, Mr. Herschel had now the means of surveying the heavens, which were possessed by no other astronomer in any of the fixed observatories of Europe. With the earnings of a profession not the most lucrative, and by the energy of his own mind, and the labour of his own hands, had this private individual done more for the prosecution of astronomical discovery than all the sovereigns of Europe combined; and many years had not elapsed before he had outstripped in discovery men educated in all the mysteries of science, and supported by all the munificence of princes. The earliest of his observations which he deemed worthy of being published, were made between 1776 and 1780, and related to the *Periodical star* α , in *Collo Ceti*. They were communicated to the Royal Society by Dr. Watson, junior, of Bath, and read on the 11th May 1783. This star was discovered in 1596 by Fabricius, and was described as appearing and disappearing periodically seven times in six years, (its period being three hundred and thirty-four days) continuing in the greatest lustre for fifteen days.

In these observations, which are not of very great importance, Mr. Herschel measured with a micrometer the distance of the periodical star from a very obscure telescopic star which preceded it, and he used a power of 449, his usual power being only 222.† This paper was accompanied by another, read at the

* No account of the aerial stand here mentioned, or of the stand of the seven-feet reflector, was ever published by their inventor.

† This very extraordinary star, known by the name of *Mera*, has a reddish yellow colour, which has been supposed to vary with its magnitude; but Captain Smith always found it to be reddish when viewed through his telescope. It has a companion, distant 116 seconds, of a pale lilac colour, whose angle of position is $88^{\circ}.9'$; its variations being from the second magnitude to invisibility, and its

same meeting, "*On the Mountains of the Moon*," in which he draws the conclusion, that the height of the Lunar Mountains has, in general, been greatly overrated, and that, with the exception of a few ($1\frac{1}{2}$ to $1\frac{3}{4}$ miles high), "the generality do not exceed half a mile in their perpendicular elevation."*

The next communication of our author to the Royal Society, was a letter to Dr. William Watson, entitled, "Observations on the Rotation of the Planets round their axes, made with a view to determine whether the Earth's diurnal motion is perfectly equable." In these observations, by which Jupiter's diurnal rotation was found to be $9^h 51' 19''$, and that of Mars, $24^h 39' 23''$, Mr. Herschel employed a twenty feet, a ten feet, and a seven feet Newtonian reflector; and he obtained his time with a brass quadrant of two feet radius, carrying a telescope magnifying forty times, and by two very good time-pieces, one having a steel pendulum rod, and the other a compound pendulum of brass and iron.

In the year 1781, Mr. Herschel was engaged in a series of observations "*On the Parallax of the Fixed Stars*," in which he used magnifying powers of 227, 460, 932, 1536, and 2010, and on the 13th March, when he was examining the small stars in the neighbourhood of *H Geminorum*, he discovered what he thought to be a comet, and after observing it till the 19th of April, he communicated "*An account of a Comet*" to the Royal Society on the 26th of the same month. In this paper, he gives its distance from certain telescopic stars in its vicinity, and by means of a *micrometer* for taking the angle of position, described at the end of the paper, he obtained measures of its angle of position with the same fixed star. Although M. Messier, to whom Mr. Herschel communicated his observations, and who had with some difficulty observed it, speaks of it in his reply as a *star* or a comet, yet neither of them suspected it to be a planet. Mr. Herschel, indeed, himself speaks of it as "a moving star, which he was happy to surrender to the care of the Astronomer Royal and others."

Before the close of the year 1781, Mr. Herschel, in a letter to Sir Joseph Banks, announced to the Royal Society, that, "by the observations of the most eminent astronomers in Europe, the new star which he had the honour of pointing out to them in

place $2^h 11' 16''$ R. ascension, and $3^{\circ} 42' 39''$ S. declination. Count De Hahn thought he saw another companion. Sir W. Herschel conjectured that a rapid change had taken place between the two stars; but Captain Smith is inclined to think that there has been little or no movement beyond what may be ascribed to the proper motions of *α Ceti* in space.—See SMITH'S *Celestial Cycle*, vol. ii. pp. 59, 60.

* It has been since proved that there are several mountains nearly twice the height of Mont Blanc.

March 1781, is a primary planet of our Solar System ;" and in gratitude to his Majesty George III., "to whose unlimited bounty he owed every thing," he gave it the name of the GEORGIUM SIDUS, a compliment which astronomers in every part of the world have refused to pay. La Lande, and others, gave it the more appropriate name of *Herschel* ; but the uniformity of astronomical nomenclature demanded another name, and the appellation of *Uranus*, sanctioned by more recent discussions, was given to the new planet.

This important discovery, by which the limits of the Solar System were extended to nearly double their former amount, was hailed by the astronomers of every country, and the highest expectations were formed of the future labours of Mr. Herschel. The Royal Society of London elected him a Fellow of their body. His Majesty George III. did himself the honour of granting him a salary of £300 a year, so as to enable him to devote his time to astronomical research ; and all the scientific bodies in Europe successively admitted him into the list of their members.

With the fine telescopes in his possession, Mr. Herschel began in October 1781, to make a series of observations on the light, diameter, and magnitude of the new planet ; and in his paper on this subject read at the Royal Society on the 7th December 1782, he described the *dark* and *lucid disc* and *periphery micro-meters* by which these observations were made. With this apparatus, by means of which one eye, looking into the telescope, throws the magnified image of a planet or comet upon, or near, lucid discs seen by the other eye, he found the diameter of the Georgium Sidus to be four seconds ; and from the distance of the planet from the Sun, as calculated and sent to him by La Lande (18·913—that of the Earth being 1), he found its diameter to be 4·454 times that of the Earth.

The researches of Mr. Herschel on the Parallax of the Fixed Stars, which we have already mentioned, were chiefly of a speculative nature, and the result of them was published in the *Philosophical Transactions* for 1782. The method first pointed out by Galileo, and followed by Flamsteed and Bradley, of measuring the zenith distances of two stars, was regarded by Mr. Herschel as liable to various sources of error ; and he was of opinion that though Bradley regarded the maximum parallax as not exceeding 1", yet "the stars of the first magnitude might still have a parallax of several seconds." The method which he substituted, and which had been originally suggested by Galileo, in his *Systema Cosmicum*, consisted in employing two stars as near to each other as possible, and differing as much in magnitude as could be found, and determining their exact place at the two opposite points of the earth's annual orbit. The par-

allax of the stars was then to be computed by a theory founded on probabilities, and involving the two postulates: 1. That the stars are, "one with another, about the size of the sun; and, 2. That the difference of their apparent magnitudes is owing to their different distances;" so that a star of the second, third, or fourth magnitude is two, three, or four times as far off as one of the first. This method, ingenious as it is, has not led to any results on which confidence can be placed. The postulates which it involves were contrary to all analogy, and have been completely disproved by the only measures of parallax which have been recently obtained. But like many other speculations, the attempt to prove or to apply them led to results more important than those which they directly contemplated. In searching for double stars suitable for his purpose, Mr. Herschel was led to the formation of those magnificent catalogues of double stars by which he enriched astronomy, and those interesting results respecting the movements and periods of binary systems, which now form the most interesting portion of sidereal astronomy.

To us who are in possession of the researches on double stars, which we owe to Mr. Herschel and his son, to Sir James South, and M. Struve, it is interesting to mark the first steps in this great inquiry.

"I took pains," says Mr. Herschel, "to find out what double stars had been recorded by astronomers; but my situation permitted me not to consult extensive libraries, nor indeed was it very material. For as I intended to view the heavens myself, Nature—that great volume—appeared to me to contain the best catalogue upon this occasion. However, I remembered that the star in the head of Castor, that in the breast of the Virgin, and the first star in Aries, had been mentioned by Cassini as double stars. I also found that the nebula in Orion was marked in Huygens' *Systema Saturnium* as containing seven stars, three of which (now known to be four) are very near together. With this small stock I began, and, in the course of a few years' observations, have collected the stars contained in my catalogue. I find, with great pleasure, that a very excellent observer, (Mr. Pigott,) has also, though unknown to me, met with three of those stars that will be found in my catalogue; and upon this occasion, I also beg leave to observe, that the Astronomer-Royal showed me, among other objects, *α Hercules* as a double star, which he had discovered some years ago. The Rev. Mr. Hornsby also, in a conversation on the subject of the stars that have a proper motion, mentioned *α Bootis* as a double star. It is a little hard upon young astronomers to be obliged to discover over again what has already been discovered. However, the pleasure that attended the view when I first saw these stars, has made some amends for not knowing they had been seen before me."*

* After his catalogue was in the possession of the Royal Society, Mr. Herschel received the fourth volume of the *Acta Academiae Theodoro-Palatinae*, containing a

Mr. Herschel's first *Catalogue of Double Stars* was read at the Royal Society on the 10th January 1787. It contains 269 double stars, 227 of which had not been noticed by any other person. It gives the comparative size of the stars, their colour, their distances (as measured by a *Lamp Micrometer*,* exhibiting two moveable lights, with whose distance seen by the unassisted eye the distance of the stars seen in the telescope was compared,) their angle of position, and the dates of the observation. The catalogue, which is divided into six classes, contains not only double stars, but also those that are triple, double-double, quadruple, double-triple, and multiple.

Mr. Herschel had now removed to Datchet, near Windsor, where he carried on his observations under the immediate patronage of the King, with new zeal and corresponding success. Towards the end of 1782, he completed his interesting paper—“*On the proper motion of the Sun and the Solar System, with an account of several changes that have happened among the fixed stars since the time of Mr. Flamsteed.*” In this paper, he notices, 1. The stars that have been lost, or undergone some capital change since Flamsteed's time; 2. Those that have changed their magnitude; 3. Those that have newly become visible; and the results which he obtained were drawn from a review of all the stars in Flamsteed's catalogue, as far as the twelfth magnitude, “to the amount of a great many thousands of stars.” Those changes which arise from a proper motion of the star, and a variation of magnitude, he suspects may be owing to every star in the heavens being more or less in motion; some, especially in slow motions, arising from their revolving round a *large opaque body*,—the stars undergoing occasional occultation, or presenting to us large spots in their rotatory movements. Hence he is led to believe, what Tobias Mayer had previously maintained, that the Sun and Solar System have analogous motions, and are advancing to a certain part of the heavens; and he found that this part was in the constellation Hercules, near the star λ , or a point somewhat farther to the north.

Having finished, in the year 1783, a very good twenty-foot reflector, with a large aperture, he employed it in studying the remarkable luminous spots at the pole of the planet Mars; and he published the results of his observations in the *Philosophical Transactions* of 1784. By means of these spots, he found that the axis of Mars was inclined to the ecliptic $59^{\circ} 42'$, and that its node was in $17^{\circ} 47'$ of Pisces, and he determined the ratio of its polar and equatorial diameters to be as 15 to 16.

paper by Tobias Mayer, giving “a pretty large list of double stars,” some of which were the same with those in his catalogue, while 31 were not contained in it.

* Described in the *Philosophical Transactions*, 1782, p. 163.

Towards the end of 1784, Mr. Herschel completed a second catalogue, containing 434 double stars; and in June 1784, and February 1785, he communicated to the Royal Society two papers "On the Construction of the Heavens." By means of his twenty feet telescope, with an aperture of $18\frac{7}{10}$ inches, and placed meridionally, he resolved into stars the nebulae discovered by Messier and Mechain, and also part of the Milky Way; and he discovered no fewer than 466 new nebulae and clusters of stars, which were not within the reach of the best common telescopes then in use. In pursuing these observations, he was led to the remarkable speculation, founded wholly on optical considerations, that as the Milky Way "seemed to encompass the whole heavens," it might be regarded as an immense cluster of stars; and that our sun, with his system of planets, was in all probability placed within it, but "perhaps not in the very centre of its thickness." In order to determine the sun's place in this sidereal stratum, he *gaged the heavens*, or ascertained the quantity of stars, or the thickness of the stratum, in various directions. In his paper of 1785, he gives a long table of star-gages; and supposing the stars to be nearly equally scattered, and their numbers in a field of view of a known angular diameter to be given, he determines the length of the visual ray, and gives a section of the Milky Way, or nebula, (resembling a fish with a long open mouth,) to which our system belongs, and near the centre of which it is placed. We regret that we cannot allow ourselves to adopt this noble and ingenious speculation;* and there is sufficient evidence to induce us to believe, as the celebrated Russian astronomer, M. F. G. W. Struve, has stated, that Mr. Herschel himself was obliged to abandon it. He found, even with his largest telescope, that the Milky Way could not be sounded; and as the same uncertainty prevails respecting the limits of the visible stars in all other directions of the celestial vault, M. Struve draws the conclusion, that "if we regard all the fixed stars that surround the sun as forming a great system—that of the Milky Way—we are perfectly ignorant of its extent, and cannot form the least idea of this immense system."† Having, therefore, no visible limits, it cannot be regarded as a nebula,‡ according to the hypothesis of Mr. Herschel. But though the Milky Way is a system whose form and extent is not, and probably never will be, determined, yet as Struve observes, there is evidently a certain law of condensation towards a principal plane, which law he has endeavoured to determine. Lambert had imagined that the deviation

* See our Review of *Kosmos*, No. VII. pp. 228–30.

† In his *Memoirs* of 1811 and 1817, Mr. Herschel abandons altogether his postulate of the equal distribution of stars in space.

‡ *Etudes d'Astronomie Stellaire*, par F. G. W. Struve. St. Petersburg, 1847. P. 63.

of the Milky Way from the form of a great circle, was owing to the lateral position of the sun within it. M. Struve, however, rejects this explanation, and is of opinion that the most condensed stratum of the stars does not form a perfect plane, but rather a broken plane, (*plan brisé*), or perhaps this stratum occurs in two planes inclined 10° to each other, and whose intersection is placed nearly in the plane of the celestial equator, the sun being at a small distance from this line of intersection towards the point 13 h. of the equator.*

In 1786 Dr. Herschel, who had been honoured with the degree of Doctor of Laws from the University of Oxford, communicated to the Royal Society *A catalogue of 1000 new nebulae and clusters of stars*, which he had observed since 1783, with his twenty feet reflector; and this was followed, in 1789, with another *Catalogue of a second thousand nebulae*. In these remarkable memoirs he regards the round clusters and nebulae, in which there is an apparent condensation towards a centre, as clusters or nebulae in the act of formation. He supposes that a central power resides in the brightest portion; that the clusters which have the most perfect spherical forms have been longest exposed to the action of these forces; and that we may judge of the relative age and maturity of a sidereal system from the disposition of its component parts; while what he calls planetary nebulae, where the compression is more equal, may be regarded as very aged, and approaching to a period of change or dissolution.

These views, ingenious though they be, have not been confirmed by subsequent observers. The nebular hypothesis to which they led, and which has been carried to such an unwarrantable extent in our own day, has been refuted by the discoveries of the Earl of Rosse; and there is reason to believe that it has been renounced by Sir John Herschel himself.†

The interesting subject of the Construction of the Heavens was pursued by Dr. Herschel during the rest of his life, and his observations are recorded in ten Memoirs published in the *Philosophical Transactions* for 1791, 1794, 1796, 1799, 1802, 1806, 1811, 1814, 1817, and 1818.

Having already, in other Articles, given an account of the great 40 feet telescope constructed by Dr. Herschel, and of the various discoveries which he made respecting the planets and satellites of our own system,‡ we must bring to a close this brief notice of his sidereal labours. In the year 1816, when in the 79th year of his age, the Prince Regent presented him with the

* *Etudes d'Astronomie Stellaire*, par F. G. W. Struve. St. Petersburg, 1847. P. 82.

† See this Journal, No. VI., p. 477, and No. VIII., p. 490.

‡ No. III., pp. 183-189; No. VII., Art. VIII. *passim*, and No. XI, Art. VIII. *passim*.

decoration of the Guelphic Order of knighthood. In 1820, he was elected President of the Astronomical Society, and in their Transactions, in 1821, he published an interesting memoir *On the places of 145 double stars*. This paper was the last which he lived to publish. His health had begun to decline, and on the 24th August 1822, he sank under the infirmities of age, having completed his 84th year. He was survived by his widow Lady Herschel, by his sister Miss Caroline Herschel,* and by an only son, the present Sir John Herschel, whose labours and discoveries in sidereal astronomy we shall now proceed to lay before our readers.

After the death of his father, Sir John Herschel had directed his attention principally to the science of Optics, but particularly to that branch of it which relates to the double refraction and polarisation of light. In this research, he obtained many new and highly important results, which are recorded in his *Treatise on Light*, published in the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*, and certainly one of the most valuable works on that subject which has ever been written. Astronomy, however, had a higher claim upon his genius; and having inherited telescopes of great magnitude and power, and been initiated into the difficult art of constructing them, he was naturally led to quit the field of optical science, and to cultivate the loftier domain of sidereal astronomy. He had proposed to himself the arduous task of re-examining the nebulae and clusters of stars which had been discovered by his father in his "sweeps of the heavens," and recorded in the three catalogues which, as we have already seen, he presented to the Royal Society in the years 1786, 1787, and 1802, and he began to execute it in the year 1825. In this re-examination he spent *eight years*, and he has given the results of it in a catalogue published in the *Philosophical Transactions* for 1832. This catalogue contains 2306 nebulae and clusters of stars, of which 1781 are identical with those described by his father, and with those published by Messier and Struve. The number of new nebulae and clusters discovered by himself was 525. During this re-examination, he observed a great number of double stars, and took their places, to the amount of between *three and four thousand*, all of which are described in the second, third, fourth, sixth, and ninth volumes of the *Memoirs of the Astronomical Society of London*.

These observations were made with a Newtonian telescope of 20 feet focus, and 18½ inches aperture, and having acquired by practice a "sufficient mastery of the instrument," and "of the delicate process of polishing the specula," he conceived the noble idea of attempting to complete the survey of the whole surface of the heavens; and, with this view, of "transporting into the

* Miss Caroline Herschel died at Hanover on the 9th of January, in the 98th year of her age.

other hemisphere the same instrument which had been employed in this, so as to give a unity to the results of both portions of the survey, and to render them comparable with each other."

The Cape of Good Hope was selected as the most favourable locality for carrying on this survey; and having fitted up the instruments and packed them carefully for the voyage, he left England, with his family, on the 13th November 1833, and landed at Capetown on the 16th January 1834, having providentially escaped from an awful hurricane to which he would have been exposed had his voyage been delayed. The spot which Sir John selected was the grounds and mansion of a Dutch proprietor, the name of which was Feldhausen, "a spot charmingly situated on the eastern side of the last gentle slope at the base of the Table Mountain." During the erection of the instruments, Sir John resided at Weltefrieden, and so quickly were his plans completed, that on the 22d February 1834, he was enabled to gratify his curiosity by viewing, with his 20 feet reflector, α *Crucis*, the interesting nebula about η *Argus*, and other remarkable objects; and on the evening of the 5th March, to begin a regular series of observations. The Observatory thus completed was situated in south lat. $33^{\circ} 58' 56'' 55''$, and long. $22^{\circ} 46' 9''.11$ east from Greenwich, and its altitude was 142 feet above the level of the sea in Table Bay.

After erecting his observatory, and determining its geographical position, the attention of Sir John Herschel was directed to the preparation of the telescopes with which his observations were to be made. He carried out with him three specula, one of which was made by his father, and used by him in his 20 feet sweeps and other observations; another was made by Sir John, under his father's inspection and instructions; and the other, of the very same metal as the last, was ground and figured by himself. They had all a clear diameter of $18\frac{1}{4}$ inches of polished surface, and were all equally reflective when freshly polished, and perfectly similar in their performance. The operation of re-polishing, which was much more frequently required than in England, was performed by himself with the requisite apparatus, which he had fortunately brought with him from England.

In the use of reflecting specula of considerable weight, it is of the utmost importance that the metal should be supported in its case so as not to suffer any change of figure from its own weight. Sir John found that a speculum was *totally* spoiled by allowing it to rest horizontally on three metallic points at its circumference. The image of every considerable star became *triangular*, throwing out long flaming caustics at the angles. Having on one occasion supported the speculum simply against a flat-board, at an elevation of about 45° , he found that its performance was

tolerably good ; but on stretching a thin pack-thread vertically down the middle of the board, so as to bring the weight of the metal to rest upon this thread, the images of stars were lengthened horizontally “to a preposterous extent, and all distinct vision utterly destroyed by the division of the mirror into two lobes, each retaining something of its parabolic figure, separated by a vertical band in a state of distortion, and of no figure at all !” The method which Sir John found the best was the following :—Between the mirror and the back of the case he interposed 6 or 8 folds of thick woollen baize, or blanketing, of uniform thickness and texture, stitched together at their edges. The metal, when laid flat on this bed, was shaken so as to be concentric with the rim of the case, and two supports, composed of several strips of similar baize, were introduced so as to occupy about 20° each, and to leave an arc of about 40° unoccupied opposite the point which was to be the lowermost in the tube. When the case is raised into an inclined position, and slightly shaken, the mirror takes its own free bearing on these supports, and preserves its figure. It is essential, however, to the successful application of this method that many thicknesses of the baize or blanket should be employed, “by which only the effect of flexure in the wooden back itself of the case can be eliminated.” As the woollen fibres, however, lose their elasticity, the baize should be occasionally taken out, and beaten or shaken up.*

In conducting his observations with these fine instruments, Sir John Herschel observed several curious optical effects, arising from peculiar conditions of the atmosphere, incident to the climate of the Cape. In the hot season, from October to March, but particularly during the latter months of that season, “the nights are for the most part superb” at a few miles distance from the mountains ; but occasionally during the excessive heat and dryness of the sandy plains, the “optical tranquillity of the air” is greatly disturbed. In some cases the images of the stars are violently dilated into nebular balls or puffs of upwards of 15' in diameter. At the end of March 1834, for example, when Saturn and γ Virginis were both in the field of the 20 feet reflector, “it could not have been told which was the planet and which the star.” On other occasions, the stars form “soft, quiet, round pellets of 3' or 4' diameter,” resembling planetary nebulae, and quite unlike the spurious discs which they present when not defined. In other cases, these pellets are seen to arise from “an infinitely rapid vibratory movement of the central point in all possible directions,” the luminous discs presenting singular phenomena

* When Sir John adopted this very simple plan, he was ignorant of the very ingenious method by which Lord Rosse affords an equable support to a large speculum, and which we have already described in this Journal, vol. ii. p. 207.

when thrown out of focus, by pushing the eye-piece farther in or pulling it farther out than its principal focus.*

In the cooler months, from May to October, and especially in June and July, the state of the air is habitually good, and after heavy rains have ceased for a day or two, the tranquillity of the image and the sharpness of vision, is such that hardly any limit is set to magnifying power, but that which arises from the aberration of the specula. On occasions like these, optical phenomena of extraordinary splendour are produced by viewing a bright star through diaphragms of card-board or zinc, pierced in regular patterns of circular holes by machinery. These phenomena, arising from the interferences of the intromitted rays, and produced less perfectly in a moderate state of the air, surprise and delight every person that sees them. A result of a more valuable kind is obtained when the aperture of the telescope has the form of an equilateral triangle, the centre of which coincides with the centre of the speculum. When close double stars are viewed with the telescope, having a diaphragm of this form, the discs of the two stars, which are exact circles, are reduced to about a third of their size, and have a clearness and perfection almost incredible. These discs, however, are accompanied with six luminous radiations, running from them at angles of 60° , forming perfectly straight, delicate, brilliant lines, like brightly illuminated threads, running far out beyond the field of view, and, what is singular, capable of being followed like real appendages to the star long after the star itself has left the field.

Another optical phenomenon, arising from a peculiar condition of the atmosphere, is described by Sir John Herschel as a "nebulous haze." The effect of it is to encircle every star, of the 9th magnitude and upwards, with a faint sphere of light of an extent proportioned to the brightness of the star. This phenomenon presents itself very suddenly in a perfectly clear sky, free from the slightest suspicion of cloud, and disappears as suddenly, lasting sometimes only for one or two minutes. Sir John Herschel states that similar nebular affections occur in our English climate, but with much less frequency and suddenness in their appearance and disappearance. He at first suspected that the phenomenon arose from dew upon the eye-piece, but repeated examination satisfied him that its origin was really atmospheric. In studying the polarisation of the atmosphere, the writer of this article has had occasion frequently to observe what appears to be the result of the same cause. When the sky was of a fine blue colour, and free from clouds, and the degree of polarisation, as indicated by the Polari-

* Sir John supposes that these phenomena may be produced by ascending and descending currents of hot and cold air rotating spirally.

meter,* very great, a sudden change frequently took place without any apparent cause; sometimes near the horizon and not at considerable altitudes, and sometimes at considerable altitudes and not near the horizon. On some occasions the effect was limited in its extent, and of a temporary kind. When it was not temporary, it shewed itself in a diminution of the blue tint of the sky, which is invariably accompanied with a diminished polarisation, and the whiteness of the sky often increased till clouds were produced, terminating in rain. The cause of these phenomena was doubtless a sudden secretion of aqueous vapour, sometimes local and of limited extent, and quickly re-absorbed; and at other times general, and terminating in a change of weather. When a cloud passed over a track of perfectly blue sky, without occasioning any perceptible diminution of tint, the polarisation of the part of the sky over which it passed was always diminished, owing, no doubt, to its having left in its path a quantity of aqueous vapour.

The description of phenomena, and the tabulated observations contained in the interesting volume now before us, occupy seven chapters, extending over 450 closely printed pages, and are illustrated with seventeen beautifully executed plates, some of which are of a very great size. The valuable contents of these different chapters would doubtless have appeared in a series of unconnected memoirs in the Transactions of the Royal or Astronomical Societies, and with illustrations very inferior, both in number and quality, had it not been for the munificence of his Grace the late Duke of Northumberland, who destined a large sum for their publication as a single and separate work. This very amiable and public-spirited nobleman, to whom the Observatory of Cambridge owes the gift of the splendid Northumberland achromatic telescope, through which the new planet Neptune was first seen, did not live to witness the final fulfilment of his noble and generous design; but the present Duke, the worthy heir of the titles and the fortune of that distinguished nobleman, carried out, in the fullest manner, the liberal intentions of his lamented brother, and thus added another claim to those which, as Lord Prudhoe, he had already earned, upon the gratitude and esteem of the literary and scientific world.

The following are the subjects which are treated in the volume under our notice:—

Chap. I. On the nebulæ and clusters of stars in the southern hemisphere.

II. On the double stars of the southern hemisphere.

* For an account of the polarisation of the atmosphere, the reader is referred to Johnston and Berghaus's *Physical Atlas*, Part vii., and *London and Edinburgh Philosophical Magazine*, December, 1847. Vol. xxxi. pp. 444-455.

III. Of astrometry, or the numerical expression of the apparent magnitude of stars.

IV. Of the distribution of stars, and of the constitution of the galaxy, or Milky Way, in the southern hemisphere.

V. Observations of Halley's Comet, with remarks on its physical condition, and that of comets in general.

VI. Observations on the Satellites of Saturn.

VII. Observations on the Solar spots.

In the first chapter, on Nebulae and Clusters of Stars, occupying 164 pages, our author proceeds, after some introductory and explanatory remarks, to give detailed descriptions and monographs of some of the more remarkable of the nebulae. As some of these nebulae are visible in Europe, and are all objects of singular interest, we shall lay before our readers a very brief notice of the most important of them.

No.	Right Ascension.	North Polar Distance.	No. of Stars laid down in the drawing.
1	18 ^h 11'	106° 15'	44
2	17 52	113 1	27
3	5 27	94 57	26
4	5 40	159 11	105
5	17 53 27"	114 21 16"	186
6	12 43 36	149 25 41	110
7	0 16 24	163 1 58	

No. 1. This remarkable nebula, which is a nebular line, with the figure of a horse-shoe at each end of it, has been observed and drawn by Mr. Mason, an American astronomer, and Mr. Lamont, a native of Scotland, who has the charge of the Observatory at Munich. Mr. Mason, whose premature death is deeply to be regretted, used a reflecting telescope of 12 inches aperture, and 14 feet focal length, constructed by himself. The fainter horse-shoe was seen neither by Mr. Mason nor Mr. Lamont.

No. 2. This nebula has also been figured by Mr. Mason, and in this as well as in No. 1, his representation differs from that of Sir John Herschel.

No. 4 is, in the author's opinion, one of the most singular and extraordinary objects which the heavens present. It is situated in the greater nubecula of the Magellanic clouds.

No. 6. This cluster of stars, improperly set down as nebular by Lacaille, is, according to our author, "an extremely brilliant and beautiful object, when viewed through an instrument of sufficient aperture to show distinctly the very different colours of its constituent stars, which give it the effect of a *superb piece of fancy jewellery*." Three of the stars are *greenish white*, two *green*, one *blue green*, one *red*, and another *ruddy*.

No. 7, (47 Toucani,) is a most magnificent globular cluster.

The stars are immensely numerous and compressed. It is compared to a blaze of light at the centre, the stars seeming to run together. Sir John Herschel has observed the extraordinary fact that the inner or compressed part of the cluster is rose-coloured, (at another time ruddy or orange yellow,) forming a fine contrast with the white light of the exterior portion. There is a beautiful double star on the south preceding edge of the last portion, but it is probably unconnected with the cluster.

Under the favourable circumstances in which he was placed, our author eagerly availed himself of the opportunity of studying the grand nebula in the sword-handle of Orion, which passed the meridian of the Cape at an altitude of 60° . He had himself delineated this remarkable nebula in 1824: *Four* representations of it, differing essentially from his, had been subsequently published; and it therefore became an object of the deepest interest to discover the causes of these discrepancies, and to ascertain whether or not a change had taken place either in the form or luminosity of the whole nebula, or of any of its parts. Dr. Lamont of Munich had, in 1837, published "rather a coarsely executed figure" of this nebula, but Sir John Herschel acknowledges that it "contains some valuable particulars respecting the apparent breaking up of the nebula into patches and knots," which had been very unsatisfactorily expressed in his figure of 1824, but "in which his observations of 1834 and 1837 fully confirm Dr. Lamont's remark." The other drawings, by Sig. Deviso, and Sig. Rondoni, published in 1839, 1840, and 1841, are too inaccurate to furnish any materials for speculation.

The splendid drawing of this nebula, which occupies a foot square, and forms the eighth plate of the present work, is one of the noblest specimens of astronomical research which is to be found in the history of the science. We view it at first with mute admiration of the skill and patience of the observer, and even forget for a while the mysterious assemblage of suns and of systems which it sets before us. No fewer than 150 stars are accurately laid down in this remarkable map, and our failing vision can scarcely descry the faint luminosity with which it shades away into the dark sky that encloses it. Neither in its general outline, nor in that of its individual portions, has it the least resemblance to any form natural or artificial. The luminous portions have no relation either in shape or intensity to the stars which bespangle it, and the stars themselves, whether we consider their magnitude or their distances, seem to have no bond of union, and no symmetry of place. Knowing, as we now do, that Lord Rosse's telescope has resolved the nebulous portion into stars, we can no longer satisfy ourselves with the speculation that the nebula is a collection of minutely subdivided matter, accidentally irregular in its outline and density, which may

some time or other be combined into stars and planets, but we view it as a mighty galaxy of systems already formed, of suns radiant with light and heat, of worlds in harmonious revolution, teeming with organic life, and rich with the bounties of their beneficent Creator. But even with these views the mind does not rest satisfied. It seeks to know how these systems are combined in the irregular nebulosity. We see it only in one direction out of an infinite number. May there not be some particular direction, in which it would appear a symmetrical formation, or if it is not a single whole, but a combination of separate formations, may there not be some direction in space along which its separate component parts would assume regular or symmetrical forms?

The variations of figure which this nebula presents in the delineations of it by different astronomers might lead a careless speculator to the opinion that it has either undergone, or is undergoing, great and rapid changes. Sir John Herschel does not participate in such an opinion,—

“Comparing,” says he, “only my own drawings, made at epochs (1824 and 1837) differing by 13 years, the disagreements, though confessedly great, are not more so than I am disposed to attribute to inexperience in such delineations (which are really difficult) at an early period—to the far greater care, pains, and time, bestowed upon the later drawings, and, above all, to the advantage of local situation, and the very great superiority in respect both of light and defining power in the telescope at the latter, over what it possessed at the former epoch, the reasons of which I have already mentioned. These circumstances render it impossible to bring the figures into comparison, except in points which could not be influenced by such causes. *Now there is only one such particular on which I am at all inclined to insist as evidence of change, viz., in respect of the situation and form of the ‘nebula oblongata,’ which my figure of 1824 represents as a tolerably regular oval, &c. &c. Comparing this with its present appearance as exhibited in Plate VIII., it seems hardly possible to avoid the conclusion of some sensible alteration having taken place. No observer now, I think, looking ever so cursorily at this point of detail, would represent the broken, curved, and unsymmetrical nebula in question as it is represented in the earlier of the two figures; and to suppose it seen as in 1837, and yet drawn in 1824, would argue more negligence than I can believe myself fairly chargeable with.*”—Pp. 31, 32.

Passing over another evidence of change, on which Sir John thinks, that “considerable stress might be laid,” we have no hesitation in avowing, without regarding our author as in any way chargeable with negligence, that we cannot concur with him in thinking that the discrepancies in question afford any proof whatever of a change in the nebula. Such an extensive change as that to which he refers has no parallel in any of the

sidereal phenomena, and would be equivalent to the creation and extinction of whole clusters of worlds and systems, within the brief interval of *thirteen* years! Had the apparent evidences of change been even more distinct and numerous, we should have exhausted every possible mode of accounting for these appearances, rather than have allowed ourselves to consider them as real. In comparing the nebular delineations of Lord Rosse, with those made with smaller instruments by Sir John Herschel, we never attribute the discrepancies to real changes in the nebulæ. In like manner we ought to ascribe the discrepancies between Sir John Herschel's delineations of 1824 and 1837, to the circumstance that the first was made in a bad climate, and the second in a good one, and to regard a difference in the purity and homogeneity of the atmosphere, as equivalent to a difference in the size and power of the telescope. The drawing of 1837,* may therefore be regarded as made with a telescope of much greater size than that with which the drawing of 1824 was made. A change in the health, and in the optical condition of the observer's eye may account for apparent changes in forms that are slightly luminous. Sir John Herschel's eye may in 1824 have begun to experience that remarkable change, to which this organ is subject between twenty-five and fifty years of age, and it may have not only recovered its original vigour, but acquired new power, when he used it at the Cape. The material differences which our author has signalled between the delineations of Dr. Lamont† in 1837, and his own in the same year, arising, we are persuaded, more from difference of climate, and from difference of vision, than from differences between the telescopes employed, may be considered as favourable to our views.

The next remarkable object of which Sir John Herschel gives a minute drawing, and a detailed description, is η Argus, and the great nebula surrounding it. It is situated in R. Ascension, $10^h\ 38' 28''$, and in $148^\circ 47'$ of north polar distance. Our author's drawing of it (17 inches by 12) has the same merit as that of the nebula in Orion, and the nebula the same unmeaning and unintelligible aspect. This nebula is regarded by Sir John as of all sidereal objects that which unites most points of interest. "Its situation is very remarkable in the midst of one of those rich and brilliant masses, a succession of which curiously contrasted with *dark* adjacent spaces (called by the old navigators *coal-sacks*,) constitute the Milky Way in that portion of its course which lies between the Centaur and the main body of Virgo." In this part of the galaxy there is an average of 3138 stars in a

* This Figure is engraved in the Memoirs of the Astronomical Society, vol. ii.

† Published with his Thesis, "Ueber die Nebelflecken." Munich 1837.

square degree, and in the denser part 5093 in the same area. The bright star η Argus, stands in the midst of this vast stratum of stars, and is remarkable for the singular change which its lustre has undergone since 1677. It was then a star of the *fourth* magnitude. In our recent catalogues it is a star of the *second* magnitude. In 1834 Sir John Herschel found it brighter than a star of the *second* magnitude. In November 1837 its magnitude was unchanged, but in December of that year he was astonished by its sudden increase of brightness, which exceeded even that of *Rigel*. In March 1843 the Rev. W. S. Mackay of the Free Church Mission, Calcutta, observed a very remarkable increase in its lustre: It had become a star of the *first* magnitude as bright as *Canopus*, and in colour and size very much like *Arcturus*. In 1844 Mr. Maclear found it almost equal to *Sirius*. In 1845 it had again begun to decline in lustre. The following is a list of these changes.

Years.	Magnitudes.	Years.	Magnitudes.	Years.	Magnitudes.
1677.....	4	1827 Feb. 1.....	1	1838.	
1751.....	2	1828 Feb. 29	2.1	1842.	
1811-1815 ..	4	1829-1833	2	1843.	
1822.....	2	1832-1833	2	1844.	
1822-1826 ..	2	1834-1837	1.2	1845.	

After giving this summary of the magnitudes of η Argus, Sir John Herschel remarks that—

“A strange field of speculation is opened by this phenomenon. The temporary stars heretofore recorded have all become totally extinct. Variable stars, so far as they have been carefully attended to, have exhibited periodical alternations, in some degree at least regular, of splendour and comparative obscurity. But here we have a star fitfully variable to an astonishing extent, and whose fluctuations are spread over centuries, apparently with no settled period, and with no regularity of progression. What origin can we ascribe to these flashes and relapses? What conclusions are we to draw, as to the comfort and habitability of a system depending for its supply of light and heat on so uncertain a source.”—P. 36.

As this nebula does not exhibit the slightest appearance of being resolvable into stars, it has therefore nothing in common with the Milky Way, on the ground of which it is projected, and may therefore, as our author supposes, be placed at an immeasurable distance behind that stratum. The accurate representation of this nebula, which includes no fewer than 1216 stars, and is represented in Plate IX. of the work before us, was a work of great difficulty and labour. It occupied several months, during which our author often despaired of being able to transfer

to paper its endless details. No description is capable of conveying the least idea of its character, and we must therefore refer our readers to the engraved representation of it.

The magnificent Catalogue of Nebulae and Clusters of Stars in the Southern Hemisphere comprehends 4015 of these objects, occupying about 80 closely printed pages. The whole of these observations, as well as the entire work of reducing, arranging, and preparing this and all the other Catalogues, were executed by Sir John himself, and have more resemblance to the labour of a long life than to the work of a few years. Each of these objects is minutely described by means of single letters or abbreviations, as in the following example:—No. 4015, not v F; L; l E; g lb M; 60; which means *not very faint; large; a little extended; gradually a little brighter in the middle; diameter 60"*; so that if the descriptions had been printed in the ordinary manner, this Catalogue would have filled a whole volume of the Philosophical Transactions.

In order to ascertain the law of distribution of these nebulae and clusters over the surface of the heavens in both hemispheres, Sir John adopted a projection which represented equal areas on the sphere by equal areas on the projection;* and having constructed, on this principle, charts of the Northern and Southern Hemispheres, divided into zones of 3° in breadth, or polar distance, and into hours of right ascension, he laid down the nebulae in each, so as to obtain a *coup d'oeil* of their distribution over the whole heavens. In this way, he was led to the following conclusions:—

"1st. The distribution of the nebulae is not like that of the Milky Way, in a zone or band encircling the heavens. * * *

"2dly. One-third of the whole nebulous contents of the heavens are congregated in a broad irregular patch, occupying about *one-eighth* of the whole surface of the sphere, chiefly situated in the Northern Hemisphere, and occupying the constellations *Leo*, *Leo Minor*, the body, tail and hind legs of *Ursa Major*, the nose of the *Camelopard*, the point of the tail of *Draco*, *Canes Venatici*, *Coma*, the preceding leg of *Bootes*, and the head, wings, and shoulder of *Virgo*. This, for distinction, I shall call the *nebulous region of Virgo*.

"3dly. Within this area there are several local centres of accumulation, where the nebulae are exceedingly crowded, viz., first, from 59° to 62° of north polar distance in the 13th hour of right ascension between the northern part of *Coma* and the fore-legs of *Chara*, as also (in the same hour) from 72° to 78° N.P.D., between the palm

* "To execute this projection, we have only to take out upon any scale the successive values of Sin. 30', Sin. 1°, Sin. 1° 30', and so on to Sin. 5°, from a table of natural sines, and these will be the radii of circles, corresponding in our projection to the successive polar distances, 1°, 2°, 3°, . . . 90°."

branch and the northern wing of Virgo, and again in the same hour from 80° to 87° N.P.D., in the northern wing and breast of Virgo. * * *

"The general conclusion which may be drawn from this survey is, that the nebulous system is distinct from the sidereal, though involving, and perhaps to a certain extent mixing with the latter. The great nebulous constellation in the northern hemisphere, which I have called the region of Virgo, being regarded as the main body of this system, and subtending at our point of view an angle of 80° or 90° , it is evident that, supposing its form to approach to the spherical, our distance from its centre must be considerably less than its own diameter, so that our system may very well be regarded as placed somewhat beyond the borders of its denser portion, yet involved among its outlying members."—Pp. 135-6.

In treating of the classification of nebulae, our author divides them into *regular* and *irregular*. The *regular* nebulae are distinguished by terms expressing their magnitude, brightness, roundness, condensation, and resolvability; and the *irregular* nebulae are subdivided into subregular, compact, branching, convoluted, cellular, fissured, and cometic. The third class of these objects, named *irregular clusters*, are those which cannot be referred to the class of globular clusters, and are subdivided into three classes—1st, rich, brilliant, and conspicuous clusters; 2d, poor and inconsiderable clusters; and 3d, those which cannot be included in either of these divisions.

Before concluding the subject of nebulae and clusters of stars, Sir John Herschel treats of the Magellanic clouds, and gives fine eye-sketches of the two nubeculae which compose them, drawn "*entirely without telescopic aid*, when seated at a table in the open air, in the absence of the moon, and with no more light than was absolutely necessary for executing a drawing at all." Sir John was driven to this mode of delineating these interesting nubeculae in consequence of all his own attempts to represent other than very small portions of the *Nubeculi Major* in the telescope, having been completely baffled by the overwhelming perplexity of its details. Representations of these two nubeculae, stated to be engraven from very correct drawings, have been published by Mr. Dunlop in the Philosophical Transactions for 1828, but they have little or no resemblance to the delineations of Sir John Herschel.*

The *Nubecula Minor* lies between the parallels of 162° and 165° of north polar distance, and between the meridians of $0^{\text{h}} 28^{\text{m}}$ and $1^{\text{h}} 15^{\text{m}}$ right ascension. It is of a generally round

* The only mode of reconciling the delineations of the two astronomers, is to suppose that Mr. Dunlop used a telescope with a small magnifying power, exhibiting details which an eye-sketch could not contain.

form to the eye, and its centre of brightness coincides with its centre of figure. The magnificent globular cluster, 47 Toucani of Bode, precedes it by a few minutes of right ascension, but has no connexion with it, and, as our author states, "with this exception, its situation is in one of the most barren regions of the heavens. The access to the nubecula minor on all sides is through a desert. Neither with the naked eye, nor with a telescope, is any connexion to be traced either with the greater nubecula or with the Milky Way." Within its area there are 37 objects entitled to entry in the catalogue as nebulae or clusters, and, altogether, 244 stars, nebulae, and clusters, the positions of which have been determined as preparatory to the construction of a chart of the nubecula and the future execution of a drawing of it.

The *Nubecula Major* is situated between the parallels of 156° and 162° N.P.D., and between the meridians of $4^{\text{h}} 40^{\text{m}}$ and $6^{\text{h}} 0^{\text{m}}$ of R. Ascension. It consists, like the Minor, "partly of large tracts and ill-defined patches of irresolvable nebula, and of nebulosity in every stage of resolution, up to perfectly resolved stars, like the Milky Way, as also of regular and irregular nebulae, properly so called, and globular clusters in every stage of resolvability, and clustering groups." It contains no fewer than 278 of these objects, and altogether 919 stars, nebulae, and clusters. Our author is of opinion, that the Magellanic clouds are "systems *sui generis*, which have no analogues in our hemisphere."

The *Second* chapter of the work before us, on the *Double Stars of the Southern Hemisphere*, is doubtless of equal importance with the First, though the detection and measurement of these stars was regarded by our author as of subordinate interest, and therefore allowed to interfere as little as possible with the discovery of new nebulae, and the determination of the places of those already known. It would have required at least ten years to have reviewed the southern heavens with the 20 feet reflector, for the purpose of detecting close double stars. Hence, the catalogue of double stars is comparatively deficient in those of the first or closest class, whose distance is *under* two seconds. The numbers in the catalogue are a continuation of those in Sir John Herschel's 6th catalogue, published in the 9th volume of the *Memoirs of the Astronomical Society*. They commence with No. 3347, and terminate with No. 5442, so that the catalogue, occupying 72 pages, contains 2095 double stars. This catalogue is followed by tabulated micrometrical measures of double stars, with a synopsis of those measures, a comparison of angles of position of double stars measured with the 7 feet equatorial, and the 20 feet reflector, and with special remarks on the

measures of particular double stars in the catalogue. The following is a brief notice of the stars thus specially referred to:—

λ *Toucani*. R. A. $0^h 46^m$ N.P.D. $160^\circ 26'$. Angle of position in 1835.92, $78^\circ 30'$, 1837.74, $80^\circ 35'$, indicating a pretty rapid angular rotation.

η 2036. R. A. $1^h 12^m$ N.P.D. $106^\circ 41'$, angle of position 1830.786, 53° ; 1836.958, $38^\circ 05'$, giving an angular motion of $-2^\circ 422$ per annum.

ρ *Eridani*. R. A. $1^h 33^m$ N.P.D. $147^\circ 3'$. Angle of position 1834.8, $120^\circ 27'$. 1836.723, $119^\circ 30'$, indicating a considerable orbital motion.

70. Dunlop. R. A. $8^h 24^m$ N.P.D. $134^\circ 10'$. Angle of position 1826.3, $20^\circ 8'$ (Dunlop,) 1836.994, $351^\circ 27'$ (Herschel,) indicating a very rapid rotation.

β *Hydrae et Crateris*. R. A. $11^h 44^m$ N.P.D. $122^\circ 58'$, angle of position in 1834.47, $338^\circ 3'$, 1838.09, $342^\circ 2'$, indicating a motion in this fine double star of $1^\circ 077$ annually.

α *Crucis*. R. A. $12^h 17^m$ N.P.D. $152^\circ 9'$. Distance of the stars $5'' 65$. This beautiful double star has excited the notice of all the more recent southern observers. Angle of position, 1826.45, $114^\circ 24'$ (Dunlop) 1835.53, $120^\circ 36'$, (Herschel,) giving an orbital motion of $-0^\circ 698$ annually, or $-0^\circ 478$, taking Sir John Herschel's observations by themselves.

γ *Centauri*. R. A. $12^h 32^m$ N.P.D. $138^\circ 1'$. "The extreme dimness of this remarkably fine but difficult double star,—each equal, and each of the fourth magnitude, necessarily renders the angles of position precarious." Angle of position 1835.32, $351^\circ 35'$, 1836.38, $357^\circ 21'$, giving an angular motion of $+5^\circ 440$ annually.

γ *Virginis*.* R. A. $12^h 23^m$ N.P.D. $90^\circ 31'$. „As the complete establishment of the elliptic motion of this interesting double star is justly deemed by our author one of the great facts of modern astronomy, he has reinvestigated its orbit, by a careful examination of all the recorded measures. He was so fortunate as to observe, about the end of 1835 and beginning of 1836, the eclipse as it were of the one star by the other, a phenomenon seen also by Capt. Smith at Bedford in January 1836. Sir John has now abandoned the large elliptical orbit which he obtained, and which seemed to be rendered necessary in order to include the observations of Bradley and Mayer. By rejecting these observations, and using only the angles of po-

* Capt. Smith, in his *Cycle of Celestial Objects*, pp. 275-283, has given an admirable analysis of all the observations on this star previous to the Southern ones of Sir John Herschel, with an orbit calculated from the Bedford observations, which yields a period of about 180 years, differing only $2^\circ 12'$ from the new period of Sir J. Herschel.—See this *Journal*, vol. vi., p. 234.

sition taken by the position-micrometer for the epoch of 1781.89, when it was first measured by Sir W. Herschel, and that of 1845.34, which was taken by Capt. Smith, he obtained the following elements :—

Excentricity,	0.87952
Inclination to the plane of projection,	23° 35' 40"
Position of ascending Node,	5° 33'
Angular distance of Perihelion from Node, on the plane of the orbit, or true angle between the lines of Nodes and Apsides,	313° 45'
Epoch of Perihelion passage,	A. D. 1836.43
Periodic time,	182.12 years.

Since this orbit was computed, Sir John Herschel has received from Mr. Macdler of Dorpat, the following measures of the angle of position of γ Virginis, beside which we have placed the almost contemporaneous observations of English observers, in order to show the great degree of accuracy which has now been attained in measuring the angle of position of two stars very near each other :—

A. D. 1841 . 355, Angles of position, 200° 6' 1841 . 34 Dawes 200° 3'	
1842 . 361, according to 196° 11' 1842 . 34 Airy 197° 25'	
1843 . 349, Maedler, 192° 9' 1843 . 33 Smith 191° 36'	
1844 . 356, 188° 55'	
1845 . 367, 186° 57' 1845 . 34 185° 24'	

α Centauri, R. A. 13^h 42^m. N.P.D. 122° 9'. "This superb double star," says Sir J. Herschel, "beyond all comparison the most striking object of the kind in the heavens, and to which the discovery of its parallax, by the late Professor Henderson, has given a degree of astronomical importance no less conspicuous, consists of two individuals, both of a high *ruddy* or *orange* colour, though that of the smaller is of a somewhat more sombre cast. They constitutg together a star which, to the naked eye, is equal or somewhat superior to *Arcturus* in lustre." The distance between the two stars has varied from 22".45, as observed by Sir Thomas Brisbane in 1824, to 16".12, as observed by Sir J. Herschel in 1837.44. Sir John is of opinion that the distance is decreasing at the rate of a little more than *half a second* annually, which, if continued, will bring on an occultation, or exceedingly close appulse, about the year 1867. The plane of the orbit passes nearly through our system. "Taking the co-efficient of parallax of α Centauri," says our author, (not α Centauri, as misprinted in Mr. Henderson's paper,) "as determined by Professor Henderson at *one second*, it will follow from what has been said, that the real diameter of the relative orbit of one star about the other, cannot be so small as that of the orbit of Saturn about the Sun,

and exceeds, in all probability, that of the orbit of Uranus." It must therefore be an object of the highest interest with astronomers, to obtain a succession of the most accurate measures of the distance of the two stars.*

The importance of *Astrometry*, or the method of obtaining an accurate numerical expression of the apparent magnitude of the stars, has been universally admitted by astronomers, for it is chiefly by a comparison of these magnitudes at different epochs, that we can become acquainted with changes that have taken place upon their surface, or ascertain the periods of their variation. Our limits will not permit us to describe the ingenious and admirable methods by which our author has endeavoured to determine the comparative intensities of the light of the stars; but we shall give the results in the following Table, which contains the photometric determination of the comparative intensities of the light of 69 stars, α Centauri being taken as the standard, and made 1.000:—

Sirius .	4.052	α Grnis	0.169	α Phœnicis .	0.101
Canopus .	1.994	θ Scorpii	0.159	ζ Argus .	0.101
α Centauri .	1.000	β Argus	0.158	α Leporis .	0.100
Arcturus .	0.726	ϵ Argus	0.152	δ Scorpii .	0.098
Rigel .	0.654	δ Canis	0.152	η Canis .	0.093
Procyon .	0.520	ϵ Orionis	0.146	γ Aquilæ .	0.092
α Orionis .	0.484	θ Centauri	0.142	δ Capricorni	0.088
Lyra .	0.446	ϵ Sagittarii	0.141	μ Argus .	0.087
α Eridani .	0.441	α Pavonis	0.140	ζ Centauri .	0.085
Antares .	0.404	β Gruis	0.138	α Muscæ .	0.084
β Centauri .	0.399	β Canis	0.134	α Argus .	0.075
α Crucis .	0.377	δ Argus	0.132	γ Cervi .	0.074
α Aquilæ .	0.350	λ Argus	0.131	π Argus .	0.074
Spica .	0.309	ζ Orionis	0.123	β Cervi .	0.073
η Argus .	0.262	β Ceti .	0.122	ι Orionis .	0.073
Fomalhaut .	0.262	α Orionis	0.120	γ Virginis .	0.070
β Crucis .	0.255	σ Sagittarii	0.116	γ Trianguli .	0.067
γ Orionis .	0.207	γ Centauri	0.107	β Trianguli	0.064
ϵ Canis .	0.198	ϵ Centauri	0.105	δ Crucis .	0.062
γ Crucis .	0.195	δ Orionis	0.104	δ Cervi .	0.060
λ Scorpii .	0.192	ϵ Scorpii	0.103	\circ 2 Canis .	0.056
α Trianguli .	0.179	ι Argus	0.103	α Circini .	0.052
γ Argus .	0.174	α Lupi	0.102	ν Argus .	0.045

* In concluding this notice of the Southern double stars, we may mention that Mr. Mitchel, of the Observatory at Cincinnati in the United States, has discovered that the fine star *Antares* is double. This important observation was made by means of an achromatic telescope, mounted parallaxically, and executed at Munich by MM. Merz and Mahler. Its aperture is nearly twelve inches English.—*Struve, Etudes Stellaires*, note 64, p. 48.

In comparing the photometric results with the conventional scale of naked eye magnitudes, Sir John Herschel has found that if these conventional values be increased by the constant fraction 0.4142 (or $\sqrt{2}-1$), *the new scale of magnitudes so arising will represent the distances of the respective stars, to which they are ascribed, from our system, on the supposition of an intrinsic equality in the light of the stars themselves*; that is, so that differences of brightness shall be merely apparent, and supposed to arise solely from differences of distance. Were this scale substituted for the present arbitrary one, " *α Centauri*," says our author, "would be our normal star of the first magnitude, *β Crucis* of the second, *α Orionis* of the third, *γ Hydræ* of the fourth, and *δ Volantis* of the fifth; and these are the magnitudes which actually stand annexed to those stars in our catalogues respectively. The effect of such a change would be to place the nomenclature of magnitudes on a natural, or at all events, on a photometric basis, easily remembered—the relation between the Magnitude and the Light of any star being given by the simple equation, $M^2 L=1$, *α Centauri* being taken as the unit both of light and magnitude."

In our author's *Fourth* chapter, *On the distribution of stars, and on the constitution of the Galaxy in the Southern Hemisphere*, he treats—first, of the statistical distribution of stars; secondly, of the general appearance, and telescopic constitution of the Milky Way;* and, thirdly, on some indications of very remote telescopic branches of the Milky Way, or of an independent sidereal system or systems bearing a resemblance to such branches. The indications referred to under the third of these heads, are deduced from a phenomenon of a very interesting kind, which Sir J. Herschel seems to have been the first to notice. It "consists in an exceedingly delicate and uniform dotting or stippling of the field of view by points of light too small to admit of any one being steadily and fixedly viewed, and too numerous for counting, were it possible so to view them." Our author was always satisfied of the reality of this phenomenon at the moment of observation, though the conviction was not permanent, the idea of an illusion arising from physiological causes having subsequently arisen. Sir John has, however, given the right ascension and north polar distance of 37 points of the heavens where this *whiteness*, or "*stippling of the ground of the sky*" was seen or suspected. In like manner, he has given the places of the points where the ground of the sky is perfectly dark or black, and "certainly devoid of any such stippling or nebulous phenomenon."

On the 25th of October 1837, Sir John was fortunate enough

* Our author has represented in his *thirteenth* plate the course and aspect of the Southern Milky Way, from Antinous to Monoceres, delineated with the naked eye by faint lamp-light in the open air.

to obtain a view of the anxiously expected comet of Dr. Halley, and in his fifth chapter, occupying 21 pages, and constituting, in our opinion, one of the most interesting portions of his work, he has given his observations on this singular member of the solar system, illustrating them with thirteen beautiful drawings of it, and adding some curious speculations on its physical condition, and on that of comets in general. On the 29th October, its appearance was most singular, and such as he had never observed in any previous comet. Its nucleus small, bright, and highly condensed, was shielded or capped on the side next the sun by a vivid but narrow crescent of nebulous light, the front of which presented an outline nearly circular, with an amplitude of about 90° from horn to horn. Within this was situated the nucleus, but at a distance behind the front or vertex of the crescent, considerably less than its *versed sine*.* On the 1st of November, it had the common appearance of a comet, with its nucleus and slightly diverging tail; but on the 26th January, after its return from the sun, it had assumed a most surprising and totally new appearance. Its head was sharply terminated, like a ground glass-lamp shade; and within this head was seen "a vividly luminous nucleus," like "a miniature comet, having a nucleus head and tail of its own, perfectly distinct, and considerably exceeding in intensity of light the nebulous head." As the comet rose higher, a minute bright point, never greater than $4''$, and like a small star, was distinctly perceived, and this point Sir John calls the nucleus. On the 25th January, the following measures were taken:—

Diameter of the comet's head in R. Ascension,	229".4	13 ^h 38 ^m
Distance of the nucleus from the vertex,	118".3	
Diameter of the head in Declination,	237".3	14 ^h 15 ^m

Upon repeating these observations in the "strong morning twilight," the results were—

Diameter of the head in R. Ascension,	193".7	16 ^h 25 ^m
Diameter of the head in Declination,	252"	16 29

The deficiency in this second measure of the head obviously arose from the effect of twilight; but we can only account for the increase in declination by concluding "*that the change was real, and that the comet was actually increasing in dimensions with such rapidity that it might almost be said to be seen to grow!*" M. Valz had pointed out the increase in the dimensions of comets as they receded from the sun, but an increase in the ratio of 5 to 6, and in so short an interval, must be regarded as a different phenome-

* This is no doubt Mr. Cooper's *Fan*, and M. Arago's '*Sector*.' The tail was obliterated by the twilight, and subsequently appeared.

non. On the 26th, the nucleus appeared as a star of the 10th magnitude, furred and nebulous; and the dimensions of the comet had greatly increased, the diameter in right ascension being 309", and in declination 329", so that the total bulk of the comet, exclusive of the coma, had greatly more than doubled in 24 hours. On the 28th January, upon looking through the 20 feet reflector, Sir John exclaims—"Most astonishing! The coma is all but gone, but there are long irregular nebulous tails in various directions." "The nucleus is now no longer a dim misty speck, but a sharp brilliant point. I cannot, however, raise a well-defined disc on it." "It is like a planetary nebula, a little hazy at the edges, 2" or 2½" in diameter." "I now see a sharp, all but planetary disc, diameter fully 1½", quite distinct from the haze about it. It is like one of Jupiter's satellites in a thick fog of hazy light." "I can hardly doubt," Sir John adds, "that the comet was fairly evaporated in perihelio by the sun's heat, and resolved into transparent vapour, and is now in process of rapid condensation and re-precipitation on the nucleus." The comet resumed its former size on the 29th, and afterwards gradually disappeared as it receded from the sun. Sir John notices the following points as especially remarkable:—

- 1st. The astonishingly rapid dilatation of its visible dimensions.
- 2d. The preservation of the same geometrical form of the dilated and dilating envelope.
- 3d. The rapid disappearance of the coma; and
- 4th. The increase in the density and relative brightness of the nucleus.

Our limits will not permit us to discuss the speculative views which these phenomena have suggested to our author. He rejects the hypothesis of Valz, that the volume of the comet is directly proportioned to its distance from the sun. He maintains that the laws of gravitation are insufficient to account for such a form of equilibrium as that of the comet, which was paraboloidal, and that such a form, as one of equilibrium, is inconceivable without the admission of repulsive as well as of attractive forces. "But if we admit," he adds, "the matter of the tail to be at once repelled from the sun and attracted by the nucleus, it no longer presents any difficulty." In order to obtain the repulsive power, Sir John hazards a theory which supposes the sun to be permanently charged with electricity. The cometic matters vaporised by the sun's heat, *in perihelio*, the two electricities separated by vaporisation, the nucleus becoming negative and the tail positive, and the electricity of the sun directing the tail, in the same manner as a positively electrified body would an elongated non-conducting body, having one end positively, and the other negatively excited. The separation of Bielas' comet

into two, travelling side by side, like the Siamese twins, presents a new difficulty which it would not be easy to explain. But here we are beyond our depth; and rather than admit Electricity as an agent residing in every sun and acting upon every system, we remain content with the humbler supposition that the rays of the sun may, in the exercise of their chemical and physical influences, find some ingredients in the tails of comets, upon which, by their joint action, they may generate forces capable of producing the phenomena which we have been considering. If we once admit Magnetism and Electricity as agents in our Sidereal systems, the Mesmerists and Phrenologists will form an alliance with the Astrologer, and again desecrate with their sorceries those hallowed regions on which the wizard and the conjuror have long ceased to tread.*

The elements and perturbations of the sixth satellite of Saturn having been elaborately investigated by Bessel, and very little being known respecting the rest, Sir John Herschel availed himself of his advantageous position at the Cape, to make a series of observations on these interesting bodies. Our readers are no doubt aware that after the fourth satellite had been discovered by Huygens in 1655, Cassini discovered the fifth in 1671, and the first, second, and third, in 1684. Sir W. Herschel discovered, in 1780, the sixth and seventh nearer the planet than the rest, the seventh being the nearest. As this nomenclature was very unsatisfactory, many astronomers named them by giving numbers corresponding to their distances from the planet; and Sir John Herschel has proposed to distinguish them by a series of heathen names, as in the following Table:—

Order from the Planet.	Old Order.	Discoverers.	Sir J. Herschel's Names.
I.	7	W. Herschel, 1780	
II.	6	W. Herschel, 1780	Enceladus.
III.	1	D. Cassini, 1684	Tethys.
IV.	2	D. Cassini, 1684	Dione.
V.	3	D. Cassini, 1684	Rhea.
VI.	4	C. Huygens, 1655	Titan.
VII.	5	D. Cassini, 1671	Iapetus.

* Our astronomical readers will be gratified to learn that M. Leverrier has found that the periodical comets of 1770 and 1844 are two different bodies; that two of the comets of Faye, Vico, and Lexell, passed close to Jupiter; and that all these comets, now permanently attached to our system, have come into it and been detained by the action of Jupiter and other bodies. M. Leverrier proves that the comets of Faye and Lexell have been in our system for at least a century, and have come a dozen of times near the earth without being observed. The comet of 1844 he proves to be the same as that of 1678, which has travelled into our system from the depths of infinite space, and been fixed among us centuries ago. It will revisit us in 1849.

Although it would be difficult to banish from our Solar System the names of the heathen gods by which the primary planets are distinguished, yet we must enter our protest against the admission of a brood of demigods. The nomenclature in the first column of the preceding Table is doubtless the proper one, and the adoption of it can be attended with no more inconvenience than we are accustomed to in analogous matters. If the houses of a street are numbered before it is completed, the numbers must be changed whenever a new house is placed on a vacant area. If it is proper or necessary to give names to the secondary planets, our mythological knowledge must be more extensively put in requisition, for we cannot allow the planet Saturn to have a monopoly of the gods. We must find names for the *four* satellites of *Jupiter*, and *Uranus*; and *Neptune* will make a similar and a heavy demand upon Lemprière.

Sir John Herschel concludes his work with a *Seventh* chapter, containing *Observations on the Solar Spots*, and conjectures respecting their cause. The figures of the spots, of which he has given us *thirteen* in a very interesting plate, were delineated from magnified images formed on a screen by means of a 7 feet achromatic refractor. One of these spots, seen on the 29th March 1837, occupied an area of nearly *five square minutes*, equal to 3,780,000,000 square miles. "The black centre of the spot of May 25, 1837, (not the tenth part of the preceding one,) would have allowed the globe of our earth to drop through it, leaving a thousand miles clear of contact on all sides of that tremendous gulf." For such an amount of disturbance on the sun's atmosphere, what reason can be assigned? Sir John Herschel justly observes, that the heating power of the sun is the cause of the great disturbances in our own atmosphere; but as there is no such source of heat to act upon the sun, we must seek for the cause within the sun itself. Now, the spots are clearly connected with the sun's rotation; and it has been long known, that they do not appear in the sun's polar regions, but are confined to two zones, extending, according to our author, to about 35 degrees of N. and S. latitude, and separated by an equatorial belt, on which spots are very seldom found. Hence he considers the phenomenon of the spots as due to circulatory movements, to and from the sun's poles, in the fluids which cover its surface, modified by its rotation about its axis; and he tries to find a probable cause for these movements. Having observed a striking deficiency of light in the borders of the sun's visible disc, extending to some distance within it, he justly infers from this deficiency the existence of an atmosphere; and he adduces "the extraordinary phenomenon of the rose-coloured solar clouds witnessed during the total eclipse of July 8th, 1842,

* * * * as definitively settling this question in the affirmative." Assuming, then, the extent of such an atmosphere "to be considerable—not merely in absolute measure—but *as an aliquot part of the sun's radius*," its form, in virtue of the laws of fluid equilibrium, must be oblately spheroidal, and consequently its equatorial thickness greater than its polar thickness. Hence, the escape of heat must be greater from the polar than from the equatorial zone, and the latter must possess a higher temperature. In this respect, the sun resembles our own earth; and on this supposition our author thus reasons respecting the causes of the spots:—

"The spots in this view of the subject would come to be assimilated to those regions on the earth's surface in which, for the moment, hurricanes and tornadoes prevail—the upper stratum being temporarily carried downwards, displacing by its impetus the two strata of luminous matter beneath, (which may be conceived as forming an habitually tranquil limit between the opposite upper and under currents,) the upper, of course, to a greater extent than the lower—thus wholly or partially denuding the opaque surface of the sun below. Such processes cannot be unaccompanied with vorticose motions, which, left to themselves, die away by degrees, and dissipate; with this peculiarity, that their lower portions come to rest more speedily than their upper, by reason of the greater resistance below, as well as the remoteness from the point of action, which lies in a higher region, so that their centre (as seen in our water-spouts, which are nothing but small tornadoes) appears to retreat upwards. Now, this agrees perfectly with what is observed during the obliteration of the solar spots, which appear as if filled in by the collapse of their sides, the penumbra closing in upon the spot, and disappearing after it."

We have been much disappointed at finding that Sir John Herschel either has not observed or has not described the extraordinary structure of the *fully luminous* disc of the sun, as we and others have repeatedly seen it through Sir James South's great Achromatic;—a structure which should have been more distinctly seen at the Cape than in our climate! This structure of which, if we recollect rightly, we have seen a beautiful drawing made by Mr. Gwilt, resembles compressed curd, or white Almond soap, or a mass of asbestos fibres lying in a *quaquaversus* direction, and compressed into a solid mass. There can be no illusion in this phenomenon:—It is seen by every person with good vision, and on every part of the sun's luminous surface or envelope; and we think affords an ocular demonstration that that surface or envelope is not a *flame*, but a soft solid, or thick fluid maintained in an incandescent state by subjacent heat, and capable of being disturbed by differences of temperature, and broken up as we see it when the sun is covered with spots or openings in the luminous matter.

Such is a brief and very imperfect analysis of a work which exhibits in a high degree the patience and the genius of its author—a work which had he done nothing else would have given immortality to his name. Whether we view it as an independent production, or as the completion of the labours of his distinguished parent, it is a work truly national, to which, however, the nation has contributed nothing. To the liberality and devotion to science of one individual we owe the valuable results which it records, and to the munificence of another its publication in a separate form, and its gratuitous presentation to the Universities, the Societies, and the principal philosophers in Europe and America. Wealth may well be coveted when we find it thus judiciously employed when in the possession of genius, and thus liberally expended, when belonging to rank and station. It is then that “the fruit of wisdom is better than gold, and her revenue than choice silver,” and that they “who love wisdom shall inherit substance, and have their treasures filled.”

Since the work of Sir John Herschel was drawn up, Astronomy has been making rapid advances in Europe; and as an opportunity may not soon occur of resuming the consideration of the subject, we shall now give a brief notice of some of the most remarkable results which have been obtained, and which have very recently been published by M. Struve of Pulkova, in his *Etudes d'Astronomie Stellaire*. This interesting work, to which we have already had occasion to refer, is, we believe, in the possession only of M. Struve's private friends. It is drawn up as a Report, addressed to His Excellency M. Le Comte Ouvaroff, Minister of Public Instruction, and President of the Imperial Academy of Sciences at St. Petersburg, and has the subsidiary title of *Sur la Voie Lactée, et Sur les Distances des Etoiles Fixes*.

After some historical notices of the speculations of Galileo, Kepler, Huygens, Kant, Lambert, and Michel, M. Struve gives a general view of the discoveries of Sir W. Herschel on the construction of the heavens, and of his peculiar views respecting the Milky Way. He compares his opinion on this subject, as maintained in 1785, with that to which he was subsequently led, and arrives at the conclusion, which we have already had occasion to mention, that, according to Sir W. Herschel himself, the visible extent of the Milky Way increases with the penetrating power of the telescopes employed; that it is impossible to discover by his instruments the termination of the Milky Way (as an independent cluster of stars); and that even his gigantic telescope of forty feet focal length, does not enable him to extend our knowledge of the Milky Way, which is incapable of being sounded.

In his next section, on the "Progress of Stellar Astronomy since the time of Herschel," he gives an account of the labours of M. Argelander, in establishing beyond a doubt the translation of our Sun, with its planets in absolute space, and those of his own son, M. O. Struve, in ascertaining the angular velocity of its motion, and in verifying the direction in which it moves, as determined by Argelander. He gives an account of the researches of Bessel, on the proper motions of Sirius and Procyon, from which that distinguished astronomer inferred the existence of large opaque bodies round which these motions are performed, and he mentions, without giving it any countenance, the bold speculation of M. Maedler of Dorpat, that the Pleiades forms the central group of the system of the Milky Way, and that *Alcyone*, the brightest star of the Pleiades, may be regarded as the central sun of the Milky Way, round which all the stars move with the same mean angular velocity, whatever be the inclination of their orbit, and their lineal distance from the central body.

Passing over his notice of the labours of the Russian astronomers, of Sir John Herschel, and Mr. Dunlop, on the subject of nebulae and double stars, he treats of the structure of the Milky Way, as deduced from the catalogues of Weisse, Argelander, Piazzzi, and Bessel. With this view, he inquires into the arrangement of the stars in the equatorial zone or belt, 30° wide, extending to 15° N. and 15° S. of the equator. In the catalogue of Weisse, there are in that belt 31,085 stars, which are divided as follows:—

Bright stars, from the 1st to the 6th magnitude,	.	664
Stars of the 7th magnitude,	2500
Stars of the 8th magnitude,	8183
Stars of the 9th magnitude,	19738

But though only these 31,085 stars were observed by Bessel, yet M. Struve has shown, by an ingenious calculation, that there are 52,199 existing in the equatorial zone.

M. Struve had shown in 1827, that if we divide the celestial vault visible in Europe by circles parallel to the equator, the stars are almost uniformly distributed in the zones thus formed, if we include at once all the 24 hours of R. Ascension; but that a very variable condensation takes place in each zone in the successive hours of R. Ascension. This will appear from the following table, showing the number of stars existing in the equatorial belt from the 1st to the 9th magnitude for each hour of R. Ascension:—

Hours of R. Ascension.	Stars from 1st to 9th Magnitude.	Hours of R. Ascension.	Stars from 1st to 9th Magnitude.
I.	1516.	XIII.	1533.
II.	1609.	XIV.	1766.
III.	1547.	XV.	1896.
IV.	2146.	XVI.	1661.
V.	2742.	XVII.	2111.
VI.	4422.	XVIII.	3229.
VII.	3575.	XIX.	2751.
VIII.	2854.	XX.	2566.
IX.	1973.	XXI.	1752.
X.	1631.	XXII.	1652.
XI.	1797.	XXIII.	1811.
XII.	1604.	0.	2055.

Hence, dividing the whole zone into six regions, of four hours each, *two* of these are rich in stars, and *four* poor, the two rich regions being from V. to VIII. and from XVII. to XX.; and hence, M. Struve concludes, from a closer inspection of the table, that there is a gradual condensation of the stars towards a principal line, which is a diameter of the equatorial zone situated between the points VI^h 40^m and XVIII^h 40^m of the disc. The line of least condensation is situated between the points I^h 30' and XIII^h 30', making an angle of 78° with the line of greatest condensation. If we divide the disc or zone into six circles parallel to the principal diameter, the density in successive bands diminishes on both sides with the distance. The line of greatest condensation does not pass through the sun. The distance of the sun from the principal diameter is about 0 15 *a*,* which is nearly equal to the radius of the sphere which separates the stars of the *first* from those of the *second* magnitude. The line of greatest condensation is not quite a straight line, but presents extraordinary lacunæ, as in Serpentarius, and accumulations, as in Orion. Hence the angle of 78° between the lines of greatest and least density is explained by these anomalies, for it would otherwise have been 90°.

Comparing this description of the state of the stars in the equatorial zone which encircles the sun, with the phenomena of the Milky Way, M. Struve arrives at the conclusion, "that the phenomenon of the condensation of the stars towards a principal line of the equatorial zone is closely connected with the nature of the Milky Way, or rather that this condensation and the aspect of the Milky Way are identical phenomena.

In extending this inquiry to the six million nearly (5,819,100) of stars visible in the twenty-feet telescope of Sir W. Herschel,

* The letter *a* denotes the radius of a sphere including all the stars seen by the naked eye.

M. Struve finds that the greatest and least densities fall very nearly on the same points of the periphery of the disc, as in the case of stars of the 9th magnitude; and he gives the following distribution of these stars in every four hours of R. Ascension:—

From	I ^h to	V ^h of R. Ascension,	391,700 stars.
"	V	IX	1,984,200 "
"	IX	XIII	235,400 "
"	XIII	XVII	387,000 "
"	XVII	XXI	2,365,100 "
"	XXI	I	455,600 "

From 0^h to XXII^h 60' of R. Ascension, 581,900 stars.

We regret that our narrow limits will not permit us to give a full account of M. Struve's latest researches on the Milky Way, in which he determines the law of the condensation of the stars towards a principal plane. After ascertaining that the number of stars in the whole celestial sphere, as seen by Sir W. Herschel's twenty feet telescope, amount to (20,374,034) upwards of twenty millions, he obtains the following values of the density of the stars, and of the mean distance between two neighbouring ones, at different distances from the principal plane of the Milky Way:—

Distance from the Principal Plane.*	Density in Stars.	Mean Distance between two neighbouring stars.
0.00	1.00000	1.000
0.05	0.48568	1.272
0.1	0.33288	1.458
0.2	0.23895	1.611
0.3	0.17980	1.779
0.4	0.13021	1.973
0.5	0.08646	2.261
0.6	0.05510	2.628
0.7	0.03079	3.190
0.8	0.01414	4.136
0.8660=Sin. 60°:	0.00532	5.729

In order to determine the radii of the spheres containing the first six classes of stars, or those between the first and the sixth magnitude, M. Struve takes as the basis of his calculation the stars in our northern hemisphere, as given by Argelander in his *Uranométrie*. Thus—

* The radius of the sphere containing all the 20 millions of stars above mentioned being unity.

Magnitudes, 1 2 3 4 5 6
 No. of Stars, 9 34 96 214 550 2342
 and from these numbers he obtains the following results, the unity in the second column being the radius of a sphere containing all the stars visible to the naked eye:—

Apparent Magnitudes according to Argelander.	Radius of the Sphere.	Progression Calcula
6	1.000	1.000
5	0.6998	0.7071
4	0.5001	0.5003
3	0.3602	0.3536
2	0.2413	0.2500
1	0.1424	0.1768

The agreement between the radii in the second column, and the geometrical progression, with the ratio $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, in the third, is very remarkable. Extending this law to stars of other magnitudes, and adopting for a new unity the mean distance of stars of the first magnitude, he obtains the following Table of the relative distances of all classes of stars, A denoting the magnitudes in Argelander's catalogue, B those in Bessel's zones, and H those seen in the 20-feet telescope:—

Apparent Magnitudes.	Distance of Interior Limit.	Mean Distance.	Distance of Exterior Limit.
1 A	1.0000	1.2638
2 A	1.2638	1.8031	2.1408
3 A	2.1408	2.7639	3.1961
4 A	3.1961	3.9057	4.4374
5 A	4.4374	5.4545	6.2093
6 A	6.2093	7.7258	8.8726
6 B	8.2161
7 B	8.2160	14.4365
8 B	14.4365	24.8445
9 B	24.8445	37.7364
H	227.782

That is,

1. The last stars visible to the naked eye, according to Argelander, are at the distance of 8.8726 times *unity*, or nearly *nine* times the distance of the stars of the first magnitude.

2. The last stars of the ninth magnitude which Bessel has described in his zones, are at the distance of 37.73 unities, or nearly *thirty-eight* times the distance of stars of the first magnitude; and,

3. The extreme stars described by Sir W. Herschel in his sweeps with his 20-feet telescope, are 227.8 unities, or *two hundred and twenty-eight* times the distance of the stars of the first magnitude,

or 25.672 times more remote than the stars of the sixth magnitude, or the farthest seen by the naked eye.

M. Struve next directs our attention to a new and very singular speculation, respecting "the extinction of the light of the fixed stars in its passage through celestial space." So long ago as 1823, Dr. Olbers, in a memoir *On the transparency of the celestial spaces*, assumed that in the infinity of space there existed an infinity of created worlds,—of suns, each of which, like our own, shone with its own light; and on this supposition, he demonstrated that the whole visible heavens should shine with a lustre equal to that of our own sun. But as such a condition of the firmament does not exist, he infers that there must be such an absorption of this sidereal light as to reduce it to what we now see in the heavens. In producing such an effect, he proves that an absorption of 1-800th part of the light of each star in its passage through a distance equal to that of Sirius from the sun, would be sufficient. In favour of such a hypothesis, no facts have been produced, but M. Struve conceives that a proof of the actual extinction of light may be found in the enumeration of stars of different orders of brightness, and that even the rate of extinction may, within certain limits, be determined.

The penetrating power of Sir W. Herschel's 20-feet telescope, he found to be 61.18, that is, by the help of this instrument, we can see stars 61.18 times more distant, than the last stars, (sixth magnitude,) which can be seen by the naked eye. This number 61.18, supposes the opening of the pupil, to be exactly 0.2 of an English inch, but as long-sighted and short-sighted persons have different powers of sight, the force of the eye is not a proper unity, in measuring the force of a telescope. M. Struve therefore substitutes for the eye a small achromatic telescope of 0.211 aperture, and magnifying *three* times, which will introduce into the eye exactly the same quantity of light that passes directly through the pupil when its aperture is 0.2, while it gives a precise image, independent of the character of the eye. With this modulus, representing the eye as unity, he could almost double the number of the stars contained in the maps of Argelander, or to speak more exactly, he counted 183 when only 100 were in the same space in the map. In taking, therefore, for unity the distance of the last stars of the sixth magnitude, (6 A,) which Argelander has seen, the visual radius or penetrating power of the Herschelian modulus will be $\sqrt[3]{1.83} = 1.2231$, or equal to $1.2231 + 8.8726 = 10.582$ times the mean distance of a star of the first magnitude. But Herschel has determined photometrically that this radius is equal to twelve times the distance of stars of the first magnitude, a remarkable coincidence which could scarcely be expected. Hence the range of the telescope of twenty feet is 61.18, $\sqrt[3]{1.83} = 74.89$ times the

distance of the stars 6 A, or $74.83 + 8.876 = 663.96$ times the mean distance of stars of the first magnitude. But instead of 74.83, the gauges of Herschel give us 25.672 for the radius of the stars 6 A. It follows therefore that the range of Herschel's telescope, as determined by astronomical observations, exceeds by scarcely one-third the range which corresponds to its optical force. How are we to explain this fact, asks M. Struve? I can see no other explanation, he adds, than that of admitting "that the intensity of light decreases in a greater proportion than the inverse ratio of the squares of the distances, or what is the same thing, *that there exists a loss of light*, an extinction, in the passage of light through celestial space." In computing the amount of the extinction, M. Struve finds that it is *one* per cent. for stars of the first magnitude, (1 A,) *eight* per cent. for stars of the sixth magnitude, (6 A,) *thirty* per cent. for those of the ninth magnitude, (9 B,) and *eighty-eight* per cent. for the Herschelians stars, H.

These views, which appear to us well founded, have been challenged by an eminent writer in the Edinburgh Review,* who, while he admits the absolute infinity in the number of the stars, maintains that the foundation of the reasoning of Olbers and Struve may be "struck away," by certain "modes of systematic arrangement of the stars in space," which, "it is easy to imagine," these modes being "entirely in consonance with what we see around us of subordinate grouping actually followed out." It would have been desirable that the reviewer had stated *one* of these modes in justification of this bold challenge. We confess ourselves unable to conceive such a mode of arrangement, although we cannot agree either with Olbers or Struve in their conclusion, that the extinction of light, if it does exist, proves that sidereal space is *filled with some fluid such as ether*, which is capable of intercepting a portion of the light which it transmits. To *fill infinite space with matter*, in order to explain a phenomenon, seems to us the very last resource of a sound philosophy. The sun has an atmosphere, widely extended in the apprehension of every astronomer. The planets have atmospheres too: Our solar system boasts of about 700 recorded comets; and M. Arago is of opinion that if the perihelia of comets are distributed throughout the system as between the sun and the orbit of Mercury, there would be *three and a half millions of comets* within the sphere of Uranus. Within the sphere of Neptune, of course, there must be many more; and Capt. Smith, in mentioning the opinion of Arago, adds, that there are many considerations which, on the same hypothesis, would greatly increase that number. If we consider, also, the enormous extent of the tails of these bodies, some of them millions of miles long, and the increase in the dimensions of comets as they recede from

* Edinburgh Review, January 1848. No. 175.

the sun, we shall have no difficulty in concluding that, within the limits of our own system, there is an immense mass of atmosphere or nebulosity capable of extinguishing a portion of the light which falls upon it. Let us, then, fill the infinite universe with similar systems—with similar obstructions to light, and we shall not require an ethereal medium to account for the want of luminosity in the starry firmament. The reviewer whom we have quoted, not satisfied with an instantaneous demolition of the speculation of Olbers and Struve, again slays the slain. "Light, it is true," he says, "is easily disposed of. Once absorbed, it is extinct for ever, and will trouble us no more. But with radiant heat the case is otherwise. This, though absorbed, remains still effective in heating the absorbing medium, which must either increase in temperature, the process continuing, *ad infinitum*, or, in its turn, becoming radiant, give out from every point, at every instant, as much heat as it receives." We do not think that we are in a condition to draw this conclusion. The law of the transmission of *heat* through the celestial spaces is a problem unsolved; and till we can explain how the luminous and chemical rays of the Sun reflected from the Moon, are transmitted to the earth, while those of heat cannot be exhibited, even when concentrated by the most powerful burning instruments, we are not entitled to urge the objection of the reviewer.

M. Struve concludes his interesting report by giving us an abstract of the unpublished but highly interesting researches of M. C. A. F. Peters, of the Central Observatory of Pulkova, on the Parallaxes and Distances of the Fixed Stars. After a historical notice of the labours of preceding astronomers on the subject, M. Peters determines the actual parallaxes of the stars from observations made with the great vertical circle of Ertel. This noble instrument, forty-three inches in diameter, is divided into every two minutes, and by means of four micrometer microscopes, its indications can be read off to the *tenth of a second*. The telescope has an aperture of *six* inches diameter, and a magnifying power of 215. The following are the results which he obtained:—

	Absolute Parallaxes.	Probable Error.		Absolute Parallaxes.	Probable Error.
61 Cygni,*	+ 0".349	0".080	Capella,	+ 0".046	0".200
α Lyræ,†	+ 0.103	0.053	Ursæ Majoris,	+ 0.133	0.106
Pole Star,‡	+ 0.067	0.012	Arcturus,	+ 0.127	0.073
Greenwich (1830,)	+ 0.226	0.141	α Cygni,	+ 0.082	0.043

* Bessel makes it 0".348 0".010.

† M. Struve makes it 0".261 0".025.

‡ Taking the mean of five values of it by Lindenau, Struve, and Preuss, do. do., and Peters, we have 0".091 0".010. M. Peters makes it 0".106 as a final determination.

In attempting to determine the parallax of stars of the first and second magnitude, M. Peters founds his researches on all the parallaxes which have been determined with sufficient precision. He finds that there are *thirty-five* stars, whose parallaxes, whether absolute or relative, are determined with a degree of precision sufficient for his purpose; but he excludes 61 *Cygni* and *Groombridge* 1830, as having a great proper motion. The general result at which he arrives is, "*that the mean parallax of stars of the second magnitude is + 0'' 116, and that the probable error of this determination is only 0'' 014.*" By combining this value with the table of relative distances in page 527, he obtains the results in the following table given by M. Struve:—

nt magnitudes.	Parallaxes.	Distances expressed in radii of the Earth's orbit.	No. of Julian years in which light traverses these distances.
1 A	0.209	986000	15.5
1.5A*	0.166	1246000	19.6
2.A	0.116	1778000	28.0
2.5 A	0.098	2111000	33.3
3 A	0.076	2725000	43.0
3.5 A	0.065	3151000	49.7
4 A	0.054	3850000	60.7
4.5 A	0.047	4375000	69.0
5 A	0.037	5378000	84.8
5.5 A	0.034	6121000	96.6
6 A	0.027	7616000	120.1
6.5 A	0.024	8746000	137.9
6.5 B	0.025	8100000	127.7
7.5 B	0.014	14230000	224.5
8.5 B	0.008	24490000	386.3
9.5 B	0.006	37200000	586.7
11 + 0.5	0.00092	224500000	3541.0

This table exhibits to us grand truths, which, we may venture to say, neither Newton nor La Place ever contemplated as within the range of human intellect. But even these are surpassed in interest by the determination of the actual velocity with which our own solar system, our sidereal home, is wheeling its ethereal round, guided by some great central body, whose light, if it has any, we may, perhaps, not have seen, and whose position we have not yet determined.

To the solution of this great problem, M. Peters applies the numbers in the preceding table. M. Otto Struve, by combining the results of his calculations with those of M. Argelander, has

* The magnitudes 1.5 and 2.5 are stars of intermediate magnitude, between those of the *first* and *second* and the *second* and *third* magnitudes.

determined that the point to which our solar system is advancing is situated at the epoch of 1840 in

Right Ascension, $259^{\circ} 35'.1$ with a probable error of $2^{\circ} 57'.5$
 And north Declination, $34\ 33.6$ $3\ 24.5$

M. O. Struve has also determined the angular value of the annual motion of the sun as seen at a right angle to its path, and at the mean distance of the stars of the first magnitude.

By Right Ascension of			
stars,	$0''.32122$	with a probable error of	$0''.03684$
By Declination of do.	0.35719	0.03562
Or by combining these	0.3392	0.0252

But as the parallax of stars of the first magnitude is $0''.209$, we can change the angular motion of the sun into linear motion in space; and hence, taking the radius of the earth's orbit as unity, we have $\frac{0.3392}{0.209} = 1.623$, with a probable error of 0.229 , for the annual motion of the sun in space.

"Here, then," says M. F. W. G. Struve, "we have the splendid result of the united studies of MM. Argelander, O. Struve, and Peters, grounded on observations made at the three (Russian) observatories of Dorpat, Abo, and Pulkova, and which is expressed in the following thesis:—'The motion of the solar system in space is directed to a point of the celestial vault situated on the right line which joins the two stars π and μ *Herculis*, at a quarter of the apparent distance of these stars, reckoning from π *Herculis*. The velocity of this motion is such that the sun, with all the bodies which depend upon it, advances annually in the above direction 1.623 times the radius of the earth's orbit, or $33,550,000$ geographical miles. The possible error of this last number amounts to $1,733,000$ geographical miles, or to a *seventh* of the whole value. We may then wager $400,000$ to 1 that the sun has a proper progressive motion, and 1 to 1 that it is comprised between the limits of thirty-eight and twenty-nine millions of geographical miles.'"—P. 108.

That is, taking 95 millions of English miles as the mean radius of the Earth's orbit, we have $95 \times 1.623 = 154.185$ millions of miles, and, consequently,

	English Miles.
The velocity of the Solar System,	$154,185,000$ in the year.
Do. do.	$422,424$ in a day.
Do. do.	$17,601$ in an hour.
Do. do.	293 in a minute.
Do. do.	57 in a second.

The sun and all his planets, primary and secondary, are therefore now in rapid motion round an invisible focus. To that now

dark and mysterious centre, from which no ray, however feeble, shines, we may in another age point our telescopes—detecting, perchance, the great luminary which controls our system, and bounds its path—into that vast orbit which man during the whole cycle of his race may never be allowed to round. If the buried relics of primeval life have taught us how brief has been our tenure of this terrestrial paradise compared with its occupancy by the brutes that perish, the sidereal truths which we have been expounding impress upon us the no less humbling lesson, that from the birth of man to the extinction of his race, the system to which he belongs will have described but an infinitesimal arc of that immeasurable circle in which it is destined to revolve. It is as if the traveller or naturalist, equipped for the survey of nature's beauties and wonders, had been limited only to a Sabbath's journey. Some mountain tops might rise to his view as he creeps along, and some peaks might disappear beyond the horizon which he leaves behind; but had the first man surveyed the constellation Hercules, to which our system is advancing, it would have seemed to him as remote as it will appear to the last of our race.

In the contemplation of the infinite in number and in magnitude, the mind ever fails us. We stand appalled before the mighty spectre of boundless space, and faltering reason sinks under the load of its bursting conceptions. But placed, as we are, on the great locomotive of our system, destined surely to complete at least one round of its ethereal course, and learning that we can make no apparent advance on our sidereal journey, we pant with new ardour for that distant bourne which we constantly approach without the possibility of reaching it. In feeling this disappointment, and patiently bearing it, let us endeavour to realize the great truth from which it flows. It cannot occupy our mind without exalting and improving it. It cannot take its place among our acquirements without hallowing and ennobling them. Though now but a truth to be received, it may yet become a principle of action, and though now veiled by a cloud, it may yet be a lamp to our feet and a light to our ways. Whom God made after His own image, he will not retain in perpetual darkness. What man's reason has made known, man will be permitted to see and to understand. "He that bindeth the sweet influences of the Pleiades, and looseth the bands of Orion, and quieteth Arcturus with his sons," will in His own time "discover deep things out of darkness," and "reveal the ordinances of heaven."

ART. X.—1. *Statements and Reflections.* By ARCHBISHOP WHATELY.

2. *A Concise History of the Hampden Controversy, &c. &c.* By the Rev. HENRY CHRISTMAS, M.A, F.R.S., F.S.A. London, 1848.

3. *A Letter to the Very Reverend the Dean of Chichester on the agitation excited by the Appointment of Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford.* By JULIUS CHARLES HARE, M.A., Archdeacon of Lewes. London, 1848.

It has been the good or ill fortune of Dr. Hampden to be the occasion of a controversy, now of some twelve years' standing, in which the real merits of the question at issue form almost the only subject, ecclesiastical or academic, that has not been canvassed. The Oxford convocation of graduates,—its constitution,—the veto of the proctors on its proceedings,—its legal competency to pass a vote of censure on a theological professor, excluding him from the board for naming university preachers,—the moral weight or technical value of such a sentence,—the bearing upon it of another Act, six years later, making the same professor member of another board,—the amount of confirmation implied in the refusal, at a still later period, to rescind the original censure;—then, coming down to the present time, the relation in which the judgment of a University stands, or ought to stand, to the practical matter of church-preferment,—the act of the Crown, or its advisers, in appointing to a bishopric a man under an alleged University ban as a heretic,—the propriety of the remonstrance of certain of the bishops,—the force of a *congé d'élire*,—the terror of a *premunire*,—the position of a dean and chapter refusing to concur in choosing the Queen's presentee,—the effect of a protest by the dean and an individual canon against the choice, as regards the chance of martyrdom,—the functions of the Archi-episcopal Court for confirming the bishop's election,—the claim of objectors to be heard against the confirmation,—and now, lastly, the jurisdiction of the Court of Queen's Bench amid this chaos of confused forms and laws:—such are a few of the interesting points raised in this edifying controversy,—not to mention the infinite personalities of imputed motives and suspected ends on all sides; while to this hour, the main original inquiry,—Is the worthy Doctor, around whom so great a dust has been gathered, a heretic or a true man?—remains substantially where it was in 1836, when all this stir began.

We have no intention of entering upon this inquiry in the present article. We regard it as an inquiry of the last importance,

affecting not only Dr. Hampden's personal reputation for orthodoxy, but the general condition and tendency of the learned theology of our day. It is an inquiry, also, of no small difficulty, and on this account, as well as from a sense of its vast importance, we would desire to devote more time and space to it than we can now command.

The influence of philosophical speculations upon the form and language of systematic or dogmatic theology, is a fact which must be admitted on all hands. In truth, traces of that influence are to be observed in the apostolic times, and the apostolic writings themselves; for there can be no doubt that some passages of the Epistles of Paul are moulded by its pressure: and at any rate, the entire first Epistle of John, as well as a portion of his Gospel also, must be viewed as an express and pointed shaping of the Christian doctrine into an attitude of antagonism against incipient Gnostic errors.* Such high warrant is there, even in the inspired Scriptures, for the adaptation of the evangelical testimony, from age to age, to the exigencies of human thought, and for the adoption of technical formulæ, more precise than might be necessary in the simplicity of early faith and love, to meet the proteus-like ingenuity of philosophizing heresy.

That the successive creeds and confessions of the Church, framed under the pressure of these ever-shifting forms of error, and with a view to meet them at every point, contracted more and more, as time rolled on, much of the subtle mode of thinking, as well as the technical terminology proper to the schools,—is a fact, as we thus see, too palpable to be denied; the blame of which, however, if blame there be, must in fairness lie, not with the orthodox, who almost always stood on the defensive, but with the transcendental speculators against whose mysticism or sophistry they had constantly to contend. It must be admitted, also, that for certain purposes, connected with the defence and confirmation of the Gospel, and with its practical and spiritual life, it is important to trace the influence of these oriental, Platonic, and scholastic refinements, on the confessedly human compositions in which the form of sound doctrine has come to be embodied; and to discriminate in the systematic theology of the modern christian world, between what it owes to this sort of handling and treatment of men, and what it derives directly from its divine source; or, in a word, between the form and the substance, between the shell and the kernel of the nut. At the same time, there is always a

* We might refer here to the second chapter of Colossians, to the introduction to John's Gospel, and particularly to the technical phraseology of his first epistle, "Jesus Christ come in the flesh," &c.

risk of mistake or of misunderstanding : of mistake on the part of the inquirer himself in so difficult a field, whose very weariness of the subtleties and technicalities among which he must dig for the sources of theological phraseology, may occasion a recoil to the opposite extreme of a dislike to all definition of the Divine mysteries whatever : and of misunderstanding, still more, whether wilful or not, on the part of readers predisposed themselves to that result, or sensitively jealous and afraid of it. Nor can it be denied that there is danger in the experiment. The pure nakedness of primeval innocency would doubtless be far preferable, in the eye of a simple taste, to all the complication of artificial costume which the necessities of dress occasion ; while yet, to cast away clothing, out of disgust with its annoyances and entanglements, might be merely to invite the cold consuming winds of the bleak winter to destroy all life, or at the best, to exhibit a bare image, and most inadequate resemblance of the primitive simplicity of the gospel.

We are far from presuming to give an opinion, at present, as to the manner in which Dr. Hampden has done his work ; nor do we mean even to hint a suspicion of his having failed in his arduous navigation between Scylla and Charybdis. We are inclined to believe the reverse ; and this impression, together with the vast and growing importance of the whole subject, would dispose us to return to an early consideration of his great work. Our object, in the meantime, in the remarks we have ventured to throw out, is to make it plain, in the first place, that the rise of a controversy out of such a treatise is by no means an event to be wondered at ; and secondly, that such a controversy, so arising, must be about the very last to admit of the sort of discussion it has met with in the case of Dr. Hampden.

For, in truth, never was there such a knotty question in theology submitted to such utterly incompetent tribunals. The first Christian emperors were ready enough to apply their imperial wisdom to the intricacies of the Athanasian controversy ; and councils,—primitive, mediæval, and Popish, have often enough assembled, under strange enough auspices, for the settlement of the orthodox faith. But Constantine and his successors were princes in theology, in comparison with our lawyers and statesmen of the present day ; and we venture to affirm, that never college of cardinals, bishops, or presbyters met, so ill-furnished with the materials for discussing a point in divinity, as the convocation of Oxford graduates.

The first subject of reflection, accordingly, which occurs to an observer of these proceedings, is the lamentable helplessness of the Church of England, in a question affecting the fundamental articles of her own faith. Here is a Divine of eminent

reputation for learning and ability, and occupying a position of vast influence, with a grave imputation of heresy hanging over him for years, and apparently without any means whatever of having it brought to a decisive and authoritative issue. With what party the blame of this suspense lies, whether with the accused or with his accusers, it is idle to inquire. The Archbishop of Dublin, it is true, assures us, that "for eleven years Dr. Hampden has been demanding a regular trial, and courting investigation," and he makes a great point of this against his adversaries. "If," he says, "they had thought it possible and desirable to remove him from that office,"—the office of Divinity Professor at Oxford,—"by bringing him to a regular trial for heresy, and obtaining a sentence against him, of course they would have done so many years ago;" and again, he remarks, concerning the application made to her Majesty's Ministers, to have the allegation of heresy inquired into:—"still more unjustifiable would it have been to have withdrawn, in compliance with the remonstrants, the recommendation laid before her Majesty, or to have subjected Dr. Hampden to a trial on charges for which these remonstrants ought to have brought him to trial—if at all—fourteen years before."

It would have been obliging if his Grace of Dublin had condescended to specify what "demands" for a trial Dr. Hampden has made, or could make, and what opportunities of bringing him to a trial his opponents have neglected.* One opportunity, at least, they have shown that they would willingly have embraced. When the two houses of Convocation met, as usual, *pro formâ*, at the recent opening of the New Parliament, a tolerably regular and carefully prepared document was circulated among the members of the Lower House—similar to what, in Scottish ecclesiastical procedure, would be called a libel—containing the heads of charge against the Bishop-elect, and extracts from his writings in support of them. We presume that if the sittings of the Convocation had been prolonged, the parties taking the responsibility of circulating that document would not

* It is true the Archbishop slightly refers to the manner of procedure in the suspension of Dr. Pusey, whose sermon "was submitted to a calm examination before persons to whom the Statutes assign that office;" and he adds, "such a trial was not deprecated, but earnestly demanded by Dr. Hampden." We might ask, when, where, and how? But, at any rate, we do not venture to determine the comparative value, in an academic point of view, of the condemnation of Dr. Pusey—unheard, as far as we remember—by a few Heads in Oxford, without any formal libel, proof, or confession, and the condemnation of Hampden, by a vote of the general body refusing to confer on him a coveted distinction, so significant and emphatic as to indicate sufficiently an entire want of confidence, and suggest to the authorities themselves the propriety of a more judicial procedure. All we say is, that neither act is an act of the Church; and it is of ecclesiastical, not of academic discipline, that we here speak.

have shrunk from the farther responsibility of founding upon it some judicial procedure, or some ecclesiastical movement. This evidently must have been their wish and intention. And we presume, also, that Archbishop Whately would scarcely have advised Lord John Russell to depart from the uniform precedent of a century since the case of Hoadley, in order to give the Convocation liberty to take up the case of Hampden.

Having referred to Whately and his pamphlet, we must be allowed a slight digression on the merits of that singular production. "Save me from my friends," may well be Dr. Hampden's exclamation, if the learned and logical Archbishop be a specimen. As a defence of Hampden, his tract has the unhappy effect of confirming nearly all the suspicions that are afloat; and as a piece of reasoning or special pleading, considered on its own merits, it might furnish apt illustrations of nearly all the fallacies in its author's Logic. Thus, the accusers of Dr. Hampden must, according to Whately, be hypocrites or fools, because, having tolerated him in a theological chair, they object to his being raised to an episcopal throne. This master of dialectics thinks he has made a capital hit, when clenching his ingenious sophistry with a somewhat irreverent use of Scripture language, he says:—

"And yet, one would think, soundness in religious opinions must be, at least, not less requisite—perhaps even more so—in a professor, who is necessarily occupied in training for the ministry successive generations of divinity students (who are required, generally, by the bishops, to attend his lectures), than in a bishop, who may, and sometimes does, take no part, personally, in the instruction and examination of candidates for holy orders—handing them over altogether to his chaplains.

"From this most important and responsible office, held by Dr. Hampden for so many years, no attempt was made to remove him. But when it was proposed to remove Dr. Hampden from the professorship, by raising him to the bench, then the reitonstrants loudly called for an inquiry into his doctrines, not on the ground of any conviction that they were heterodox, but avowedly on the ground of the clamour that had been raised against him.—'And as they cried out, and cast off their clothes, and threw dust into the air, the chief captain commanded him to be brought into the castle, and bade that he should be examined by scourging, that he might know wherefore they cried so against him.—Acts xxii. 23, 24.

'A stranger, then, such as I have been supposing, would be struck with this as one of the most extraordinary features of this strange transaction—that men professing great zeal for purity of doctrine should be found imploring Ministers to 'make choice of some other person' for a bishopric, and to leave Dr. Hampden in an office especially calling for sound theological views, because his views are unsound!'

But this by no means exhausts the Archbishop's proof against Dr. Hampden's accusers. He runs them up still more triumphantly into a corner. Why object to his being a bishop, when you submitted, (not without recalcitration, however,) to his being a professor? Nay, why, and with what consistency, make a stir about his "heterodoxy," even, in the office of a teacher of theology, when you left him undisturbed before, for three whole years, as an Examiner for degrees in Arts, as Principal of St. Mary's Hall, and as Professor of Moral Philosophy.

"It would require a longer discussion than I shall now enter on to prove that the doctrine of Dr. Hampden's *Bampton Lectures* is, in fact, sound; but that it was not thought objectionable by the great mass of the university is an assertion much more easy to be established than most theological dogmas; for, first, the vote of convocation relative to these lectures was not passed till about three years after they were delivered, and about two years after they were published. If they were heretical, why were not proceedings taken at the time? Why was the discovery and the censure of the heterodoxy delayed till Dr. Hampden was nominated Regius Professor?

"The answer—the only answer, as far as I know—that is given by Dr. Hampden's assailants, is one to which I invite your attention, that you may judge what is the soundness of their reasoning, and what the truth of their statements. It is, that during this interval of three years, Dr. Hampden did not hold any responsible situation, in which the soundness of his religious views was a matter of high importance. Now, supposing this assertion true, what a wretchedly lame plea does it constitute! A man is selected from the whole university by the heads of colleges to deliver a course of lectures from the university pulpit, which are afterwards published (printed they must be by the injunction of the 'founder'), and go forth to the world with this high sanction from the university—uncensured; and then this university is represented as saying to the Christian public,—'It is true this work is full of most dangerous errors, and is likely to mislead you; but that is nothing to us, so long as the author is not placed in any new situation of responsibility within these walls!' Such is the plea set up in behalf of the university by those who urge her claim to control the decisions of the Sovereign's responsible advisers.

"But this plea, which would be worthless and disgraceful if founded on fact, is utterly at variance with facts. During that interval above alluded to, Dr. Hampden occupied no less than three highly important official situations. 1. At the time of the publication of the work he was, and continued to be afterwards, the senior Public Examiner for Degrees of Arts; one essential requisite in the examination being theology. 2. He was, during the above-mentioned interval, appointed by the Chancellor of the University Principal of St. Mary's Hall; having, as such, the complete superintendence of the studies, secular and religious, of the members of that hall. And, 3, he was also ap-

pointed, by certain heads of houses to whom the nomination belongs, Professor of Moral Philosophy."

This is surely strange reasoning. Does Dr. Whately think it will impose on men acquainted with the practical working of affairs? Is a prescription of three years' toleration of a hopeful man at college, to bar a challenge of his opinions, when he is brought out of comparative obscurity into the sunshine of Royal patronage and favour? And is the bench of bishops to be regarded as a house of refuge for damaged theological reputations, —a retreat in which unsafe divinity professors may be shelved and sheltered with impunity? The Archbishop may be quite right as to the matter of fact, in ascribing the prosecution of his friend to motives less creditable than a zeal for orthodoxy; but he is unhappy in his mode of proving it.

Nor is this the only instance of peculiar logic in the Irish Primate's Tract. Towards the close of it, adverting to certain unfounded rumours that had prevailed in Oxford, as to the formation of a league among such men as Arnold, Hampden, Blanco White, Dr. Hinds, and himself, in opposition to the Tractarian confederacy, the Archbishop proceeds to notice another false report:—

"In the same spirit it has been lately maintained, I understand, by a near connexion of Mr. Newman, that Dr. Hampden's *Bampton Lectures* were the work not so much of himself as of Mr. Blanco White, because the latter had been observed to give utterance in conversation to many of the sentiments contained in the lectures; no very wonderful result, one would think, of his having heard or read what Dr. Hampden was writing, and having acquiesced in some of his views. Any who are at all acquainted with Dr. Hampden, how little soever they may concur with him in opinion, must be well aware that he is one of the last men to adopt and maintain, on any human authority, conclusions of which he was not fully convinced."

What an ingenious shifting of the question! Coincidence in opinion with Blanco White is the real charge,—a charge serious enough against a theological professor, and in this case, as we firmly trust, utterly unfounded. But how adroitly does the Archbishop dispose of it, turning it into an imputation of moral dishonesty, as if Hampden were accused of joining with Blanco White in asserting what he did not believe. And all this is to make way for a clever retort, which it is needless to quote, on what he goes on to describe as the unscrupulous policy of a certain unscrupulous Tractarian Triumvirate.

But the choicest specimen, perhaps, is in the following extract:—

"By those who do maintain the principles of those tracts Dr. Hampden's *Bampton Lectures* were early assailed, though with little or no

effect on the public mind. The cause of the hostility was obvious. His lectures were, as well as all his subsequent publications, wholly at variance with the doctrines of the tracts, especially with their endeavours to place human expositions and formularies, and oral traditions, on a level with the Holy Scriptures. Accordingly, the title, as I remember, of one of the earliest pamphlets written against him was, *The Foundations of the Faith assailed at Oxford*. One may naturally ask, 'of what faith?' Manifestly, the faith of the tract party, and not that of our Church. For this latter has its foundation on Scripture alone, which is expressly declared to 'contain all things necessary to salvation;' while creeds and other formularies are received by our Church, not as a foundation, but a superstructure, 'because they may be proved by holy writ.' Now, it has never been even pretended that Dr. Hampden impugned the authority of Scripture. The 'faith,' therefore, whose 'foundations' he was accused of assailing (and he did assail them very powerfully,) is manifestly not that of the Church, but that of those nominal members of it who studiously inculcate doctrines utterly opposed to its fundamental principles."

Let the syllogism of this paragraph be noted. I. *Major premise*: 'The Church grounds her faith on Scripture alone, receiving creeds and other formularies, "because they may be proved by holy writ." II. *Minor premise*: Dr. Hampden never impugns the authority of Scripture; (not a word here as to his treatment of "creeds and other formularies," the only point at issue.) III. *Conclusion*: 'Therefore, the faith he is accused of assailing cannot be that of the Church, but must be that of persons inculcating doctrines opposed to the Church's fundamental principles. Or, otherwise: The Church receives creeds and other formularies as proved by holy writ; Dr. Hampden never impugns the authority of holy writ: Therefore, in the matter of creeds and other formularies, he agrees with the Church. We humbly submit this example as one which may be embalmed in the Book on Fallacies, in the next edition of Whately's Logic.

Seriously, we question the good taste of the Archbishop's interference in this strife, and we more than doubt his competency to deal with some of the elements which it seems to us to involve. Whether doctrinally, ecclesiastically, or politically viewed, we regard the controversy as fraught with principles, and ominous of issues, such as neither his subtle reasoning nor his simple story-telling—when he amiably and narratively recites his old and somewhat silly contest with his Suffolk parishioners about a foot-path—can adequately dispose of. Matters are evidently hastening to a crisis that will demand different treatment from that with which such prelates as Archbishop Whately,—and we may add, such premiers as either Lord John Russell or Sir Robert Peel,—would heal the disjointed frame-work of Church and State.

Thus, to return to our first observation, the helplessness of the Church, in the exercise of discipline generally, and especially in the trial of alleged heresy or heterodoxy of doctrine, has hitherto been, to a large extent, her security. Her safety has been supposed to lie in impotency and quiescence. But let the waters be troubled, and the stir among the invalids will be such, as scarcely anything but the personal presence of the Saviour Himself can meet. For the Church of England is the child of compromise;—not the compromise of christian charity, but the compromise of worldly prudence.

Our heart bleeds for the unhappy position of the evangelical men in the English Church at this moment; and we are inclined to ask, in all kindness and sincerity, can they be in earnest in hailing this Episcopate of Hampden's as a triumph? That men like Whately should rejoice in his victory over the Tractarians; cheer on Lord John in his curt answers to recusant deans, and be charmed with the piety of his closing letter, in which, having gained his end, he sighs for a godly parochial ministry—is all very well. But can the really spiritual evangelical men in the Church be satisfied or at ease?

Is it true, or not, we would like to ask, that the present Government intended to promote Montague Villiers to the bench? His nomination to the See of Manchester was announced in the daily papers, and particularly in the usually recognised Government organs; and he is understood to have received congratulations on that score,—premature perhaps, but premature through excessive faith in the honour of politicians. He would indeed have consecrated the new Manchester Bishopric. We say nothing against the eminent scholar and schoolmaster who has obtained the appointment. We know no reason why he should not be a bishop. But we repeat the question—not to the Government who are the patrons, for we do not object to their exercising their own discretion, but to the evangelical party in the English Church—is it true that Montague Villiers was named for the Manchester Bishopric,—a man certainly eligible on positive as well as negative grounds,—a man whose promotion might have been a prelude of good to England,—and that the Ministry abandoned him out of deference to the remonstrance of Bishops—or of a Bishop? We lay little stress on any charge of Millenarianism on which such remonstrance might be based; we might differ from Mr. Villiers on that head as much as the Bishop of London himself. But as a representative of the Evangelical party in the English Church, and, what is more, of energetic vital godliness itself, Montague Villiers, with all his Millenarianism, is worth several Hampdens, orthodox to the very core. And still, therefore, the question recurs,—Did

the ministry listen to objections against Mr. Villiers for Manchester, from the very prelate, or prelates, whom they defied in the case of Hampden's nomination to Hereford? Did they choose a nobody instead of Villiers for the one see, on the representation of the very party or parties whom they would not gratify by presenting anybody but Hampden to the other?

The answer may be prohibited, or it may be painful. If the actual history of the Manchester Bishopric be what it is currently reported to be, it must seriously detract from the *éclat* of the Premier's boldness in the matter of Hereford. Montague Villiers is not a man for the modern liberal party to rally upon. He has no sufficient backing. Beyond personal devotedness, family station, and public usefulness not often rivalled among the working clergy of the Church, he has no name to conjure up the spirit of the age. Hampden has. With all the other qualifications, as we hope, in nearly equal measure with Villiers, he has the advantage of an anti-tractarian, anti-sectarian, anti-creed-and-confession repute, such as eminently fits him for being the Helen of a modern liberal and ecclesiastical Trojan war. To offend the High Church party for the sake merely of an evangelical appointment, would be madness;—to fall in with a man who, being evangelical, is also something more, and around whom all may cluster, from the extreme of liberalism, renouncing every standard, to the height of evangelical piety, acquiescing only too thankfully in anything that is not Puseyite—was a lucky chance which our friends in power could not be expected to throw away. In Villiers, they could merely promote personal worth; with Hampden, they could, in addition, play a public game.

Meanwhile, however, we must again ask, what do the evangelical men in the English Church say? Are they satisfied and at ease? Is this King-Log system of Church government as much to their mind as ever? Are they content that there should be no form of ecclesiastical procedure for the trial of heresy? Is the crown-patronage, with the statute of premunire to enforce it, still to be their sheet-anchor? All very well, when it is a tractarian conspiracy that is to be put down. But have they no fear that their turn may come next? The Dean of Hereford, weak and fond old man as he is, is a victim whose impotent resistancy occasions a smile rather than a sigh. But change the scene and the actors, and some untoward enough things may happen. An earnest evangelical Dean and Chapter, with a semi-popish prelate given them to choose, or a pious rector or vicar, (for higher game than curates is now aimed at by our Exeters,) taken to task upon the burial or baptismal services, are conceivable cases such as, ere long, may make our friends feel the want of a tri-

bunal more free than the Primate's Commissioners, for hearing objections against Bishops-elect, and a synod more spiritual than the Court of Arches, for putting a presbyter's soundness in the faith to the proof.

The truth is, in the matter of doctrine, the reformed Church of England is notoriously and avowedly constructed on the plan of the widest possible comprehension. With her Articles on the one hand, giving a clear enough Calvinistic sound, and her Service-book on the other, giving no certain sound at all, she was of set purpose made from the beginning, with bosom wide and capacious for embracing all shades of opinion short of open popery, and the most ultra-puritanism. It is well known that neither Henry, nor Elizabeth, nor the statesmen who aided them in constructing the Anglican Establishment, wished to put any obstacle in the way of the priests and bishops of the popish Church conforming to the new order of things, and that many, accordingly, did conform, with their religious views almost wholly unchanged; while again, if the more evangelical party would only submit to the ceremonies—putting on the right clothing, and making the right obeisances—they might teach what spiritual faith they chose, with little risk of interruption or ejection. It was upon questions of outward order and ritual uniformity, that the Puritans in the seventeenth, and the Wesleyans in the eighteenth centuries, were separated from the Church; and still, all along, down to the present day, the distinctive policy of the English Establishment, considered as one of the institutions of the country, may be fairly said to rest on a basis of doctrinal latitudinarianism.

This, indeed, has often been loudly proclaimed as its very boast; that it is inquisitorial into no man's faith, provided only there be a decent submission to her articles as articles of peace, and to her canons, or to her usages, as conditions of order. The very variety of sounds given forth by its trumpet, in the various sections, of high and low Church, Calvinism, Arminianism, rigid orthodoxy, laxity almost reaching Socinianism itself—sacramentarian superstition even worse than Papal, and such mere indifferentism as an honest Deist might be ashamed of,—this wide range of parties, from the tropical fervor of the most spiritual and missionary zeal, to the polar ice of mere dead formality,—has not unfrequently been paraded by the defenders of the Church's political position, as one of its chief recommendations. And doubtless it has its advantages; if the State Church is to be viewed as an engine of Government,—an ornament of the monarchy and the aristocracy,—a profession, like the army, of patronage and preferment,—a refuge and harbour for men of learned leisure,—an institute for keeping up the decencies of public worship and

private virtue throughout the land. But there are inconveniences also attending this plan. It of course implies that the Church binds herself, or consents to be bound, hand and foot; she becomes a corporation of clergy, disciplined, marshalled, and ruled, as any other body of civic functionaries, in the law, or in public offices, must be: she ceases to have any internal power of action over or among her own members; she can be no judge in controversies. Nor is this the worst of it, in so far as the State is concerned. The plan, as a piece of State-craft, proceeds upon the assumption of a general quiescence among all the elements of strife embosomed in the Church, and in an age of defective spiritual vitality, this may be practicable: dead men fight no battles, as they tell no tales. But when a breath from above, or from below, or both, causes the dormant energies of opinion and faith to stand forth,—Actæon's task among his hounds, or that of Cadmus with his crop of dragon-teeth, is scarcely worse than the statesman's who would still try to keep the peace. In the icy atmosphere of the 18th century, the Bangorian controversy, smothered in Convocation, might harmlessly diffuse itself through the press over the cold and stagnant surface of the religious world of that age. But the Hampden controversy has fallen on other days, having more in them of Laud than of Hoadley; and it remains to be seen if adroit management can balance parties now, better than it did then, or if the children struggling in the womb of Mother Church must come to the birth, or be allowed to fight out their quarrel.

This indeed is the worst of that adjournment of difficult questions which often looks at the time so wise and prudent, they are almost sure to come up again. Weary of an exciting and exhausting warfare, the contending parties in a great practical controversy are fain to listen to proposals for a truce; an ambiguous *concordat* is plausibly framed and authoritatively imposed; politicians get rid of an embarrassment, and polemical divines and party leaders are surprised into a sort of sulky and suspicious silence. But the smouldering embers of the fire are still there, over which worldly statesmen need to tread very warily, and which any rising breeze of religious excitement may again fan into a flame. Ecclesiastical history is full of illustrations of this remark; and the progress of passing events, in Scotland, England, and Ireland, seems destined to furnish another instance of its truth, in the acting over again of the very serio-comic drama that was but rehearsed, as it would seem, in the days of the Jameses and the Charleses.

Out of the Hampden controversy, so far as it has gone, there are three several parties, at the least, who, we cannot doubt, are extracting matter of grave reflection.

We turn first to the beaten party—the defeated or discomfited Tractarians. The movement against Hampden from the outset has been mainly promoted by them. It is true that in the Oxford Commemoration vote of 1836, the Evangelicals were nearly as earnest as the Puseyites; and we well remember the pressing and somewhat prosy articles in which for weeks the *London Record* laboured to rally the Evangelical troops for the muster. But now it seems that, in their simplicity, they were taken in and made tools of by the more wily Jesuits, whom they joined as allies. With what measure of exact truth—for even honest men forget—and with what good grace, this acknowledgment is made, we pretend not to determine; although it seems odd that the *London Record*, like his Grace of Oxford, should persist in harping upon certain virtual retractations and withdrawals, and so forth, on the part of Dr. Hampden, all of which Dr. Hampden himself emphatically, and not without indignation, disowns. This is too like an after-thought or an expedient for falling softly, to be altogether creditable, either in a religious journal or in a Right Reverend Father in God; and we might have wished a franker and fuller judgment, in the light of calm inquiry, upon those very statements and speculations which the *Record* once thought so dangerous. But passing from this, we firmly believe that it was by his Protestantism, and not by any heresy, that Dr. Hampden made himself obnoxious to the semi-papists: it is by them chiefly that the war against him has been carried on; and it is they that feel his success, in spite of their utmost efforts to thwart it, to be a “heavy blow and great discouragement.” We have observed, however, as we think, that this party contrive often to rise by means of falls, and to extract power out of defeat; they may be driven back a little when they come forward too boldly, and they may drop their premature air of confidence and arrogance; but they work all the more insidiously and diligently underground, leavening more extensively with their manifold and soothing subtlety the predisposed society of an uneasy age. Nor are there wanting in this discomfiture, or in the manner of it, circumstances which may leave behind other and more lasting influences than many think. “The Hampden Farce,” as it is flippantly if not wittily called, or, by way of mock-heroic, “The Hampden Tragedy,” may be forgotten sooner by the gainers than the losers of the game. No doubt it is pleasant to see Henry of Exeter get a fall, and poor old Dr. Merewether, making dolorous preparation for imaginary martyrdom, and Lord John Russell handling his antagonists with such inimitable ease and consummate tact. But there is a sting left behind that may prove no laughing matter even to “them that win.” Good, decent, and devout Church-of-England men will

not have much satisfaction in looking back on the Bench of Bishops set at nought, the venerable cathedral hierarchy befooled, and shouts of ridicule and scorn ringing through the crowded Old Bow Church in the city, at one of the most solemn of the Church's ceremonies—the confirmation of a successor to the Apostles. Nor can the University-men, scattered all over England, fail to have their pride hurt, and their *esprit-de-corps* stirred, by the slighting way in which a double vote of Convocation is set aside, as little better than the clamour of a rabble of boys. It has been remarked, that if any one had set himself to contrive a case, for the express purpose of bringing out all the awkwardnesses and anomalies of the Church's relations to the State, he could not have done better than get up this Hampden controversy. The real truth is, that, just as Cicero once remarked of a certain order of soothsayers, that he wondered how they could look one another in the face without laughing; so we scarcely can fancy a High Churchman, or a Churchman of any sort, uttering henceforth his high-sounding boast about "our Apostolic Church," "our admirable Liturgy," and so forth, without a smile or a blush, as he thinks of the Hampden controversy. Some Hotspur, bent on fretting him, has but to get a starling taught to cry "The Hampden Controversy." There must be many besides the Puseyites, among both clergy and laity, to whom all this will be as gall and wormwood. They cannot hold up their heads before any intelligent foreigner, or any intelligent man at home or abroad, Protestant or Papist, who has the least idea of what a Church of Christ is, and defend such a state of things as the Hampden controversy brings out. We have no doubt that this feeling, which must ever be growing more intense the more such men reflect on what has taken place, will swell the ranks of the Tractarians, or at least of those who, upon Church principles, have large sympathy with the Tractarians. What may be the next phase of that ominous movement, it is impossible to say. Already many of that party are loudly complaining of the Establishment as, in its present ultra-Erastian constitution, an incubus rather than a support to the Church; and there are "brave words on the bridge," about the Church separating from the State. It is assumed that she is to march off with all her endowments upon her back. How far the courts of law and the houses of Parliament would be disposed to sanction such a heavy-laden flight from Troy, and how far our Tractarian friends might be willing to escape from thralldom unencumbered,—may be as yet insoluble problems. But the very meeting of points like these is significant of a storm brewing, which cannot long be pent up; and believing, as we do, in spite of sceptical sneers in certain quarters, that the re-

vived Church-feeling in England is both a great reality and a great power,—no sham, as Carlyle would call it, or mere wordy noise, but a living thing,—we own it seems to us impossible that it should not grow and practise and prosper for a season. There is more danger to our statesmen, as it seems to us, from under-rating than from exaggerating this moral force, plainly destined as it is to be one of the master-forces of the age : and one reason why we take the view we have now indicated of the bearing of this Hampden controversy on the progress of Puseyism, is just that we conceive it likely to encourage our merely secular politicians of all parties in treating with unwise incredulity and unstatesmanlike contempt the spiritual power over which they appear to have gained so easy and so cheap a victory.

Next, we have a word to say of the Evangelical men in the Church of England, whom we love as brethren, and with whose devotedness we earnestly sympathize. It is the misfortune of their position,—if they will bear with our plain speaking, that they have always found themselves merely tolerated in the Establishment,—barely tolerated and nothing more,—and they have been far too contented, and far too thankful for this scanty measure of grace. Generally speaking, they have been a handful, conscious of their being in the Church merely by a sort of sufferance, or as if by accident, and only too grateful for being let alone. The two thousand ejected Puritans in 1662, doubtless left some good men behind them in the Establishment ; but these few who then remained must have felt like Samson with his locks shorn ; their strength was gone out of them ; their being still within the pale when their more decided friends were all driven out, must have been a sort of wonder to themselves ; and they must have been apt to go very softly all their days, lest unpleasant questionings should arise. Something of this same sensitiveness, as we cannot but fear, has become the hereditary characteristic of evangelical religion in England, “within the pale.” Bolder spirits, like the Wesleys, Whitefield, and Rowland Hill, have been either almost or altogether forced out ; and it has been the fashion for the pious clergy who still adorn the Establishment, and are its very salt, to make a merit of what is recorded on the tomb of the ancient Roman matron as her highest praise, “*Domum mansit—Lanam fecit* ;” “she tarried at home and span.” Public spirit is certainly not one of their virtues, as churchmen, at least in its active form ; nor does the idea of their having anything to do with the Church as a whole, beyond the customary commendation of our “apostolic constitution,”—“our admirable Liturgy,” &c.,—and the shibboleth of a common horror of dissent and voluntarism, ever seem to enter into their minds. As to discipline, in particular, they have a shrewd guess, we

imagine, that their safety lies in there being none; while the government, again, if there is to be a government, they would for a similar reason, much rather see lodged in civil, than ecclesiastical hands. They dread accordingly, and deprecate the revival of the Convocation, or its being allowed to proceed to business; nor is this much to be wondered at; since without material modifications and reforms, the machinery of the two houses would scarcely work without collision; or if it did, it would be none the better for the evangelical party and their principles. The tender mercies of Parliament are probably less cruel. A difficulty, however, is troubling our friends, now that Parliament is so very miscellaneous a body. While the Test and Corporation Acts remained in force, and the House of Commons was professedly composed of orthodox Church-of-England men, it was a good enough body, it seems, for giving laws to the clergy, setting up and pulling down Bishoprics, regulating the exercise of discipline, and passing all sorts of acts for the internal government of the Church. But now, first Dissenters, secondly Papists, and at last Jews, being admitted into the Legislature, some faint sense of incongruity begins to strike the evangelical mind. There is a remedy however. The *London Record* has its specific for curing the evil; not the revival of the Convocation; the *Record* leaves that move to the Tractarians; but a much more politic plan,—a *coup d'état* worth the noticing:—

"It is one thing to revive the Convocation, and another, and a very different thing, to attempt to remove the anomaly and inconvenience which has arisen in the constitution of Church and State within the last twenty years. Till within that period, the anomaly which now forces itself upon the dullest apprehension, did not exist, and the mutual working of the Church and State was regarded as effective for all practical purposes.

"The revival of the Convocation, dangerous at any time, is undeniably full of peril in the present unprecedented state of the Church.

"But as our readers well know, the anomalous position of Church and State, of which we have recently heard so much, and whose existence cannot be denied, does not consist in the powers of the Convocation being in a dormant state. The grand and pressing anomaly as we all know, has been occasioned by the repeal of the Test and Corporation Act, by the passing of the Act for the emancipation of the Roman Catholics, and it would be perfected by the admission of Jews into Parliament. The consequence of these changes has been, that instead of the ecclesiastical affairs which required the regulation and supervision of the body of the Church being brought under the consideration of men of professedly Church principles, and who are bound, by their profession and by their oaths, to do whatever in them lies for the prosperity of the Church of which they are members,—the affairs of the Church come under the review of an assembly not

composed of Churchmen merely, but having a considerable intermixture of Dissenters of every name, of Roman Catholics, and soon, possibly of Jews. These must be regarded, not as the friends, but as the enemies of the Establishment. As it regards most of them, if they are true to their principles, they must be so. And accordingly, it is obvious to the common sense of mankind, that some change by which this evil and dangerous state of things may be removed, is urgently required.

"And we have no doubt suitable means would be found to remedy the evil, if statesmen, professedly warmly attached members of the Church, would give even an equal measure of attention to her interests, as they afford to objects of the Jewish or Popish parts of the community. We have little doubt that the difficulties in the way of some such scheme as that glanced at in our paper of this day week, would be removed by deliberate consideration, and, in consequence, the affairs of the Church necessary to be brought before Parliament, be submitted to that part of the assembly only, which are professedly members of the Church.

"We earnestly call the attention of our readers to this subject. The importance of the maintenance of our Apostolic Church, upon her Scriptural foundations, who shall declare! The importance of it to the spiritual interests of the nation, but not less so to its temporal prosperity! The deepest thinkers which this country has produced have considered the union of the Church and State indispensable for the perpetuity and wellbeing of the latter. That this sentiment is a prevailing one among the most intelligent and respectable parts of the community in the present day, is apparent to all. And under these circumstances, shall the mind of the Government and the time of the Legislature be occupied, and often wasted, day after day and night after night, on subjects of comparative insignificance, and shall sufficient thought and time not be given to the removal of the anomalous position of things of which we are writing, pregnant as it is with mischief to the Church, and not only to the Church, but to the Government and Constitution of the empire?

"The change of which we speak could be effected, of course, only under an Act of Parliament. That some actual difficulties may exist to the measure we point at, we do not question; that many more would be conjured up by the enemies of the peace and prosperity of the Establishment, is certain. But the proposal is so reasonable in itself—That the opponents of the Church should not legislate for the Church; and that the immense bulk of this Christian nation, with the Queen at its head, and by the instrumentality of its representatives, should so legislate for her, while the demand for such an improvement is so urgent—that every honourable man, true and loyal to the cause, must feel that no degree of time nor labour is too great to accomplish it."—*London Record*, January 1848.

What would our friends call this residuum of the House of Commons, after undergoing such a new-fashioned sort of "Pride's purge?" "The Rump-Parliament," or "The Rump

of Parliament?" Surely serious men must be at their wit's end for a defence of their position, when they can gravely entertain and propound so grotesque a device as this. A Church governing herself, we can understand; and a Church governed by the State; but what is this? Whom would this anomalous body represent? Not the Church confessedly, for ~~the~~ Church has nothing to do with their election,—except indeed to descend, as would be the inevitable issue of this contrivance, to an unseemly struggle on every hustings, and at every polling-booth, for a paltry triumph over Dissenters; and just as little the State, for the country delegates its power and voice to Parliament as a whole, not certainly to a mere sectarian fragment of it. The proposal, however, scarcely admits of discussion, and is important only as showing how the yoke is beginning to gall, and the chain to fret, even the most patient advocates of an Erastian civil supremacy over the Church.

On the whole, it seems but too evident that the *laissez-faire*, or as we would call it in Scotland the *do-nothing* policy, will not long suffice in these days for keeping the English Establishment in order. We do not indeed expect much more to be made of the Hampden controversy; it will probably soon pass away from the columns of our Newspapers, like any other nine-days' wonder; and quiet people will begin to repose again peacefully on the pillow of Mother Church's hereditary conservatism, looking back on this affair as a sort of passing *street-riot*, which only serves to prove more clearly the efficiency of the police, and the general security of the city. But such riots, often repeated, may become dangerous, especially when "gown" as well as "town" are involved in them,—grave and reverend seigniors in surplices, as well as light-headed youth in *déshabille*; and the Anglican Zion cannot well afford, any more than Jerusalem with the besieging army of Titus round about it, to despise internal *émeutes*. As it is, there are some matters connected with this very case still outstanding for adjustment. Dean Merewether and Canon Huntingford, are, at this moment, within the reach of the pains and penalties of a *premunire*; for in spite of all the ridicule that has been poured on the Dean, for his bombastic enough challenge of martyrdom, and his tardy consent at last to put the Chapter's seal to the election of Dr. Hampden, we are inclined to think that, after all, the worthy gentleman has really done enough, by his opposition in the vote upon the *congé d'élire*, to entitle him at least to the honour of a confessor. The words of the Statute are singularly precise and stringent; and we can scarcely doubt that if Lord John thought it worth while, he could obtain a verdict against his reverend correspondent for not merely

"intimating," but executing, "his intention of violating the law."* Then there is the pending suit in the Court of Queen's Bench, which probably will end in little more than such an assertion of civil jurisdiction in a spiritual cause as may make still more palpable than at present the prostrate helplessness of the Church. Meanwhile the theological questions raised by the Bampton Lectures remain as the germs of future doctrinal discussions: men anxiously watch the ambiguous conduct of Wilberforce, by far the most note-worthy Bishop on the bench, and the most likely to play an influential part in any coming crisis; while many a case of conscience,—prospective, perhaps, as yet, but becoming daily less improbable, must be beginning to press hard upon the minds of the more intelligent of the clergy, as well as to perplex the more practical understandings of the laity.

* The whole letter of the Premier will be preserved, doubtless, in the next edition of "Lacon," as a specimen of courtesy and curtness almost unrivalled. As to the law, it is to our apprehension plain enough. The Statute 25 Henry VIII., c. 20, has the following provisions:—

"Sec. 4. By virtue of which licensee, the said Dean and Chapter, to whom any such license and letters missive shall be directed, shall with all speed and activity in due form, elect and choose the same person named in the said letters missive, to the dignity and office of the Archbishopric or Bishopric so being void and none otherwise.

"And if they do defer or delay their election above twelve days next, after such license or letters missive to them delivered, that then for any such default, the King's Highness, his heirs and successors, at their liberty and pleasure shall nominate and present by their letters patent, under the great seal, such a person to the office and dignity so being void, as they shall think able and convenient for the same.

"Sec. 7. That if the Dean and Chapter proceed not to election, and signify the same according to the term of this Act, within the space of twenty days next, after such license shall come into their hands, or if the Archbishops or Bishops shall not confirm, invest, and consecrate the person elected or presented, or else if any of them, or any other person or persons, admit, maintain, allow, obey, do, or execute any censures, excommunications, interdictions, inhibitions, or any other process or act, of what nature, name, or quality soever it be to the contrary, or let of due execution of this act, then every Dean and particular person of the Chapter, and every Archbishop and Bishop, and all other persons so offending and doing contrary to this Act, or any part thereof, and their aiders, counsellors, and abettors shall run into the dangers, pains, and penalties of the statute of the provision and premunire made in 25th of King Edward III., and in the 16th of King Richard II."

In the reign of Edward, by Statute 1 Edw. VI., c. 2, the election by the Dean and Chapter was stigmatized as a mere form, and as such superseded, and the nomination by the Crown was declared sufficient of itself, a step supposed to be preliminary to the abolition of Chapters altogether. But one of the first Acts of Elizabeth's reign (1 Eliz., c. 1.) was the repeal of the Statute of Edward, and the revival of that of Henry, under which, as it appears to us, the Dean, and the "particular person of the Chapter," who concurred with him, *par nobile*, have fairly won their spurs as probationers in the knight-errantry of modern Church-of-England martyrdom. That Lord John will go beyond the missile of a quietly ironical epistle, or awaken the dormant thunders of the Prerogative, we, of course, do not imagine for a moment; but the Queen's spiritual supremacy stands out here in a very edifying light.

One remark, on this last aspect of the affair, we must be allowed to make. Among all the most conscientious and earnest ministers of the Church of England, we believe there is scarcely one, of whatever views, who does not feel that, according to the undoubted law and constitution of the Establishment to which he belongs, he may at some time or other be placed in circumstances in which, as an honest man, he could neither obey nor acquiesce. Some, as we understand, have on this very ground steadily refused to accept of office or benefice in the Church, considering it safer and more consistent to continue all their days in the ministry of private proprietary chapels. Others, again, shelter themselves under the hope that in their own persons a case of such difficulty may not arise; and so long as it does not arise, they think that they, as individuals, incur no responsibility, but may freely exercise their parochial functions. They thus, as it were, take their chance, and run the risk of being found recusants, should an emergency come. And in regard to any society of which a man is a member without, or against, his own choice, as by nature or by force, such a rule of action may be defensible. As a private citizen, for instance, a man may know that there are laws of the land which, if he came under their operation, he could not conscientiously obey; but knowing this, he has generally no alternative except that of awaiting whatever consequences may follow, should he be forced to refuse obedience. It is otherwise, however, when there are engagements voluntarily formed, and obligations voluntarily undertaken. The martyrdom of Dr. Merewether, had it been more real than it is like to be, would have failed to command general sympathy; for this very obvious reason, that the Dean, in accepting office as a priest and dignitary in the Established Church, had, of his own accord, and by his own vows, submitted himself to the law and constitution which he was then violating. He knew all along that he might be called, in virtue of his office and his oath, by unquestionably competent authority, to perform the act which his conscience would not suffer him to perform; that being the acknowledged rule of the institute in which he took service and held rank. Such a state of matters is altogether different from that which occasioned the recent Disruption of the Church of Scotland. In that case, the real question turned upon the competency of the civil courts to control the ecclesiastical in matters spiritual; and the instant that question of competency was settled authoritatively, by the refusal of the legislature to grant redress, the parties aggrieved left the Establishment. Many of them might have remained without the least risk of their ever being required personally, by any individual act of their own, to violate their conscientious convictions, or person-

ally to incur civil pains and penalties. But they felt that they could not continue voluntarily to belong to an Institution whose acknowledged constitutional rule was now such that they could not promise to obey it. Nor is this case at all analogous to the implied reservation of the rights of conscience, in submission to all human authority; on the sacred principle, that in the last resort we must obey God rather than man. Here the question is, as to a man's belonging to a corporation the very condition of whose existence, as a corporation, involves terms with which he knows that he cannot, if called upon, comply. In short, it is the question, not of this man or that man being liable to civil coercion in the discharge of spiritual functions; but, first, of the lawfulness of the Church of Christ, in any of its branches, remaining in a position in which such coercion can in any instance be exercised, not by force of persecution merely, but by course of undoubted law; and, secondly, of the lawfulness of holding office in such a Church, without protest and earnest effort for reformation, in the first instance, with the ultimate prospect, if need be, of separation from the Establishment.

In a word, we cannot conceal our impression, that whatever body in the English Church, whether more or less numerous, powerful, and influential, first grasps the scriptural ideal of the Church's spiritual independence and freedom, will have an element of strength for wielding the sympathies of the English mind, such as Statesmen and mere Establishment-men little dream of. We are well aware of Arnold's love for the Crown's supremacy, which he grasped as a palladium against priestly tyranny, and we know there is a large body in the Church far less enlightened than Arnold, who drowsily repose on the arm of State-patronage and State-rule,—adherents of Canterbury, as D'Aubigné calls them,* rather than of Oxford,—on whose *vis inertiae* and old, blind, hereditary, church-and-king sort of loyalty, many place indefinite reliance. It is evidently to this dead weight that politicians mainly trust for the preservation of the English Establishment, and by means of it, with such episcopal appointments as those of Prince Lee and Hampden, they hope to hold the balance tolerably even between the two living extremes—the Evangelical and the Tractarian, giving no decisive advantage to either. It is evidently as a mere Establishment-man that Lord John Russell feels and acts on these occasions; he is bent on working the Church as a part of the machinery of the State—an appendage of the Crown and the

* See D'Aubigné's recent work on Germany, England, and Scotland. The whole chapter on the English Church, written in a most friendly spirit, might be pondered with advantage by the Evangelical part of it.

aristocracy. Sir R. Peel would doubtless play the same game, though perhaps more cautiously. We are persuaded it is a game which, if our Evangelical friends will not see through, the Tractarians do. They are consolidating a church-power, superstitious and tyrannical it may be, but yet spiritual; and we cannot but think it high time that something definite and decisive were done on the other side towards preparing, at least, for the assertion of a Church-independence, spiritual also, but at the same time, evangelical, catholic, and free.

INDEX

EIGHTH VOLUME OF THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

- Ancient halls at Oxford, origin of, 35.
- Angling, the Art of, 297—fire-side pleasure and water-side profit of works on angling, 297—Mr. Stoddart's views on the parr question, 299—serious consequences will ensue if his opinion is declared to be correct, 300—character of the common trout, 303—influence of pike on loch-trout, 305—extreme size attained by trout, 307—the rate at which trout grow, 308—the local characters of lakes and rivers influence the growth, 304, 311—materials of the angler's art, 311—false theory regarding artificial flies, 313—Mr. James Wilson's notion of them, 315—true theory of fly-fishing, 317—Ephemera's arguments in favour of fly-fishing being exclusively an art of imitation examined, 318—Mr. Stoddart repudiates specific imitation, 328—hanging the fly advisable, 333—method of *raising a fish*, 334—pleasures of Northern angling, 337.
- Annals, the, a short-lived race of invaders, 390—the "Book of Beauty" an exception, 390.
- Antarctic Voyage of Discovery of Sir J. C. Ross, 177—origin and object of the expedition, 177—equipment of the Erebus and Terror, 179—plan of the expedition, 180—Auroral phenomenon, 181—Cape, Prince Edward's Island, Possession Island, 183—geology of Christmas Harbour, 185—Kerguelen's Island, 185—Expedition of d'Urville and Wilkes, 187—whales of the hunchback kind, 191—magnificent range of lofty mountains, 191—taking possession of Franklin Island, 193—volcano of Mount Erebus, 194—great icy barrier, 195—description of it, 197—Aurora Australis, 198—fossil forest, 202—inhuman murders, 203—wild cattle hunting in the Falkland Islands, 209—wild horses, 210—Cape Horn, 211—return of the Expedition and its results, 213—controversy respecting the Antarctic continent, 215.
- Aquinas, his merits as a philosopher, 26.
- Arnold's idea of Church union, 132—his sentiments on the exclusive nature of the priesthood of Christ, 137.
- Artificial flies, false theory regarding, 313.
- Ashley, Lord, his exertions in behalf of females and children in mines and collieries, 59, 81.
- Astronomical Observations of Sir William Herschel, 497—of Sir John Herschel, 501.
- Aurora Australis, description of, 199.
- B
- Baird, Mr. Walker, his opinion on Jury trials in civil cases, 101.
- Bald, Robert, Alloa, his graphic description of the work performed by female coal-bearers, 55.
- Bonaventura, his extravagant opinions concerning the attributes and worship of the Virgin to be considered the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, 345.
- Bunsen's Church of the Future. *See* Church of the Future.
- Chalmers' Posthumous Works, 398—feelings which the departure of a great, good, and beloved man irresistibly calls forth, 393—we cannot help following in our thoughts him whose loss we deplore, into the region which he has just entered, 394—the great transition, 395—Dr. Chalmers a ruler among men, 396—a continual mystery in the power which such a man exerts over his fellows, 396—emotions called forth by his personal appearance and demeanour, 398—particular merits of his portraits and bust, 398—

- Dr. Chalmers a man of genius, 400—an enthusiast in its true and good sense, 400—his simplicity, 401—Saturday among the Pentlands, 403—his eloquence like a flooded Scottish river, 404—his imagination and style, 407—had a keen relish for material and moral beauty, 409—impressions produced on first hearing him preach, 410—what Dr. Chalmers was as a whole in the full round of his notions, tastes, affectional, and powers, may be learned by a perusal of his Sabbath Exercises and Daily Scripture Readings, 411—extracts illustrative of this, 412—general character of the volumes, 420.
- Chevalier, Charles, merits of his work on microscopes, 262.
- Chisholm, Mrs. C., her evidence relating to Australia, 447.
- Christmas literature, character of, 379.
- Church of the Future, 130—the Jerusalem Bishopric, 130—terms of co-operation between the Lutheran and Anglican Churches, 131—Dr. Arnold's ideal of Church union, 132—views of Bunsen and Arnold compared, 137—Bunsen's view of the remedial system of the Gospel, 141—his Church theory, 143—the Church and the congregation, 144—Vinet's Voluntarism, 147—starting point from which a Church system is to be evolved, 148—the Church a Divine institute, 151—hiatus between the theory and its details, 153—the Scriptural argument, 155—relation between Church and State, 157—Bunsen's *Manifold Evangelical Ministry*, 159.
- Clärchen in Egmont, one of Goethe's female characters, 289.
- Close parishes, systematic destruction of cottages in, 371.
- Colonization from Ireland, 421—colonization only subsidiary to other measures, 422—murders of Major Mahon and Mr. Lloyd, 423—overpeopled and diseased districts, 425—plan suggested by Mr. De Vere, 426—state of Ireland from the loss of the potato, 429—conacre system, 429—Irish poor law, Dr. Chalmers' evidence 431—Mr. Kincaid and Lord Palmerston, 435—fearful mortality among the emigrants, 437—money orders from emigrants, 439—Mr. Elliot's evidence, 439—prosperity of Port Phillip, 441—Colonel M'Arthur's account of Australia, 445—Mrs. Caroline Chisholm, 447—match-making in Australia, 448—New Brunswick, 451—Canada, 453—Prince Edward's Island, 454—the West Indies, 455—fitness of the Irish to be placed together in detached colonies, 456—Father Mathew's opinion, 457—proposed modification of the poor-law, 458—work and wages in Ireland, 460—the hope of the emigrant, 463.
- Combinations and strikes in collieries, evils of, 76.
- Conacre system in Ireland, 429.
- Criticism's Christmas Carol, 378—Christmas literature should possess a peculiar character, having hilarity as its predominating spirit, 379—Eothen and the *Iliad*, 381—a word to sullen philosophers, 383—what is a Christmas carol? 385—Dickens' "Battle of Life," as an illustration, 385—Landseer and J. W., 387—J. W.'s designs perfect specimens of animal portraiture, 387—the execution of the human figure, by the same artist, not so felicitous, 387—similar incongruity in the Egyptians noticed, 388—the "Annals," 390—the *Book of Beauty*, 390.
- D
- Daguerreotype of Dr. Chalmers, 399.
- Dickens' "Battle of Life," an illustration of what a Christmas book ought to be, 385.
- Double stars, 513.
- Duncan's portrait of Dr. Chalmers, 399.
- D'Urville, Captain, his Antarctic expedition, 187.
- E
- Education of the mining population, 75.
- Elliot, Mr., his evidence on the subject of emigration, 439.
- Emigration as a remedy for Ireland, 421.
- Engiscope, construction of, 258.
- Ephemera. See Angling.
- Erasmus, a successful delineator of female character, 294.
- Erigena, his merits as a philosopher, 26.
- Explosions in mines, 73.
- F
- Female characters of Goethe and Shakespeare, 265—Goethe's double nature, 266—poetic realism of Goethe—his first loves, 268—the Frankfort Gretchen, 271—the poetic epistle, 272—the signature—the parting, 273—the Margaret in Faust, 274—the two sisters of Strasbourg, 276—love and jealousy—French scene, 278—the parsonage of Sesenheim, 280—walk by moonlight with Friederike, 282—the family of Sesenheim at Strasbourg, 285—Maria von Berlichingen, 287—the Clärchen in Egmont, 289—characteristic differences between Goethe and Shakespeare, 291—English and German women, 293—female characters of Erasmus, 294.
- Females in collieries, 55-58.
- Fischer, Prof. A., merits of his work on the pancreatic microscope, 264.
- Fly-fishing, different theories regarding, 313-327.
- Forsyth, Mr., his opinions on Jury trials in civil cases, 97, 100.
- "Fortunio," beautifully illustrated by J. W., 387.
- Fossil forest in the valley of the Derwent, near Hobart Town, description of, 202.

Friederike, one of Goethe's female characters, 282.

G

Gallifet, his testimony in regard to the worship due to the Virgin, 342.
Geology of Christmas Harbour, 185.
Giotto, history and character of, 13.
Gladstone, Mr., his sentiments on Episcopal Ordination, 131.
Goethe. *See* Female Characters of Goethe, 265.
Gordon, Rev. O., character of his work on the improvement of the present examination statute at Oxford, 38.
Gordon, Watson, his portrait of Dr. Chalmers, 399.
Goring, C. R., M.D., analysis of his works on microscopes, 258.
Gretchen, the Frankfort, one of Goethe's female characters, 271.

H

Hampden Controversy, the, 534—the question of heresy has never been investigated, 534—Archbishop Whately's defence, 537—helplessness of the Church of England in a question affecting the fundamental articles of her faith, 541—effects of the Hampden Controversy, 545—position of the Puseyite and Evangelical Sections of the Church of England, 553.
Herschel, Sir John, his Astronomical Observations, 491—biographical notice of Sir William Herschel, 493—his early observations, 494—his discoveries, 497—on the Milky Way, 499—discoveries of Sir John Herschel, 501—his voyage to the Cape—telescopes prepared, 502—Duke of Northumberland's munificence, 505—grand nebula in the sword-handle of Orion, 507—supposed changes in nebulae, 508—great nebula of γ Argus, 509—law of distribution of nebulae, and clusters of stars, 511—Magellanic clouds, 512—double stars, 513—astrometry, distribution of stars, galaxy, 517—Halley's Comet, electrical theory of comets, 519—Saturn's satellites, 521—solar spots, 521—motion of the solar system, 523, 532—parallax of stars, 531.
Hill, Mr., his calotypes of Dr. Chalmers, 399.
Hogg, Mr., furnishes us with an account of Shelley's life at Oxford, 224.
Huber, V. A., work of, on English Universities, 23.
Italy, Mediæval history of, 161.
Ireland, Colonization from, 521.
Jerusalem Bishopric, 130.
J. W.'s designs perfect specimens of animal portraiture, 387.
Jury Trials, abuses of, 82—history of trial

by jury in civil cases, 83—its introduction into Scotland, 85—national feeling against it, 87—benefits of juries in criminal cases, 89—unfitness of an ordinary jury to try civil cases, 91—composition of juries, 93—list of assize on a colliery case analyzed, 95—absurd mode of conducting jury trials, 96—singular modes of making up verdicts, 99—testimonies of Mr. Forsyth, Mr. Walker Baird, and Lord Meadowbank, to the unpopularity of the system, 101—the remedy, 103.

K

Kineaid, Mr., his exertions in Ireland, 435.

Lands of the Bible Visited and Described, by John Wilson, D.D., F.R.S., 107—interesting nature of researches into the geography of the Lands of the Bible, 107—track of the Israelites on leaving Egypt, 109—place of the passage of the Red Sea, 111—discovery of ancient mines, 113—theory of Leipsius as to Mount Sinai, 115—topography of Jerusalem, 117—Samaritans of Nabulus, 119—scenery around the Lake of Tiberias, 121—Safed, 121—sources of the Jordan, 123—cities on the coast below Lebanon, 124—ruins on the Phenician coast, 127.
Leipsius, his theory as to Mount Sinai, 115.
Liguori, F., his work on the Glories of Mary defended by Mr. Ward, in his ideal of a Christian Church, 353.
Lindsay's Sketches of the History of Christian Art, 1—office of the imagination vindicated, 3—sacred character of all true art, 4—Spinello's dreams and death, 7—progress of Christian art, 8—Byzantine school, 9—Norman and Gothic styles, 11—Nicola Pisano, Giotto, 13—contemplative school of Siena, 15—links between Ancient and Modern History, 17—intimacy between Dante and Giotto, 19.
Lutheran and Anglican Churches, terms of co-operation between, 131.

M

McArthur, Colonel, his account of Australia, 445.
McLeay, K., his portrait of Dr. Chalmers, 399.
Magellanic clouds, 512.
Margaret in Faust, 274.
Maria von Berlichingen, one of Goethe's female characters, 287.
Mariolatry or Worship of the Virgin, 339—openly and zealously inculcated among Catholics, and at the same time vehemently denied among Protestants, 341—that she is worshipped, established by the testimony of Father Gallifet, 342—by the Roman Breviary, 344—by the writings of canonized saints, 345—the litany

to Mary, 347—fresco at Lucca described by Mr. Vicary, 348—the “Glories of Mary,” 351—Mr. Ward and Liguori 353—hymns to the Virgin, 355—history of the scapular, 357—privileges bestowed on the Carmelites, 359—references to Mary in the Gospels, 360—origin and progress of Mariolatry, 363—its effects, 365.

Marriage Bill, the Scottish, 465.

Mathew, Father, his opinion on Irish character, 457.

Meadowbank, Lord, his opinion on jury trials in civil cases, 101.

Mediæval History of Italy, 161—Italian communi, 163—soldiers of fortune, 165—plan and character of Ricotti’s work, 166—merits and faults of Signor Fabretti’s work, 168.

Medwin, Thomas, character of his “Life of Shelley,” 218, 223.

Microscope, construction and use of, 258—analysis of the works of Dr. Goring and Mr. Pritchard, on microscopes, 258—they are better fitted to assist the skilful than to instruct the ignorant, 261—merits of M. Charles Chevalier’s work, 262.

Miller, John, his pamphlet on the Abuses of Jury Trials, 93—his analysis of, and remarks on the list of assize in a jury case, 95.

Mining Population, state of the, 52—early slave-state of the colliers, 53—their emancipation, 53—graphic description by Mr. Bald of a female coal-bearer at work, 55—effect of the publication of his work, 57—report of the Commissioners to inquire into the condition of females and children employed in mines and collieries, 58—Lord Ashley’s bill, 59—reports by Mr. Tremehere, 65—evils of combinations and strikes, 67—advantages of a savings’ bank, 69—the store system an unquestionable grievance, 70—explosions—ventilation, 72—education of the mining population, 75—improvement of dwelling-houses, 77.

Mount Sinai, theory of Leipsius regarding, examined, 115.

N

Nebulæ, 507-513.

Newman, F. W., character of his translation of Huber’s work on the English Universities, 23.

Niccola Pisano, influence of, on painting, 13.

Northern angling, pleasures of, 337.

O

Oxford, life of Shelley at, and expulsion from, 225-233.

Oxford—University reform, 21—Huber’s work characterized, 23—origin of the University, 24—scholastic philosophy, 25—Erigena and Aquinas, 26—Platonism and Aristotelianism, 29—University feuds,

31—-independent jurisdiction, 32—origin of the ancient halls, 35—rise of the college system, 36—tutorial and professorial systems compared, 37—propriety of combining with classics the study of the sciences, 40—the Aristotle of Oxford, 41—University discipline, 43—the rights of corporate property, 44—need of a Commission and of reform, 46—subscription of tests, admission of Dissenters, 49—Oxford’s responsibilities, 51.

Panoramic microscope, description of, 264.

Platonism and Aristotelianism compared, 29.

Poor Removal Act, the object for which it was passed, 370.

Port Phillip, prosperity of, 441.

Portraits of Mr. Chalmers, 399.

Pritchard, Andrew, analysis of his works on microscopes, 258.

R

Red Sea, point at which the Israelites crossed, 111.

Ricotti, Hercules, plan and character of his History of the Bands of Free Adventurers in Italy, 166.

Robinson, Dr., his opinion as to the point at which the Israelites crossed the Red Sea controverted, 111—his views on the topography of Jerusalem generally confirmed by Dr. Wilson, 117—Dr. Wilson’s testimony to his high merits as a traveller, 129.

Ross, Sir J. C., his antarctic voyage of discovery, 177.

Savings’ Banks, advantages of, to the collier, 69.

Scottish Marriage Bill, the, 465—the subject, unfortunately, has been surrounded with clamour, prejudice, and ignorance, 465—basis of the marriage contract, 467—law of marriage as it exists at present in Scotland, 468—evils of the law, 469—two very noted cases, 471—gives facilities to voluntary divorce, 472—singular case illustrative, 473—perplexities of *repute*, 475—the New Bill, 476—the two sets of objectors, 479—opinion of the Lord Advocate, 480—the Acts of 1672 and 1690, 483—proclamation of banns not abolished, 485—amount of protection given by the present law, 487—a suggested improvement, 490.

Settlement and Poor Removal, law of, 366—history of legislation as to settlement, 367—Act of 1834, 367—orders of removal and their effects, 369—Poor Removal Act, 370—systematic destruction of cottages in close parishes, 371—proposals of poor-law functionaries, 373—union and parochial rating and settlement compared,

- 375—union of town parishes not liable to objection, 377.
- Shakspeare. *See* Female Characters of Goethe and Shakspeare, 265.
- Shelley, Percy Bysshe, Life and Writings of, 218—his pedigree, 218—placed at Sion House School, Brentford, 220—goes to Eton for two years, 221—personal appearance, 225—life at Oxford, 225—intercourse with Mr. Hogg, 225—personal habits at College, 229—expulsion from Oxford, 233—his first marriage, 235—residence at Keswick, and intercourse with Southey, 235—residence in Ireland, 236—"address to the Irish people," 236—strange incident in Shelley's life while in Wales, 240—his second marriage, 242—"Alaster," 243—"Queen Mab," 247—"Revolt of Islam," 249—"Senci," 250—"Prometheus Unbound," 251—"Lycidas" and "Adonais," 253—Shelley as a translator, 255.
- Siena, contemplative school of, 15.
- Southey, his intercourse with Shelley at Keswick, 235.
- Spinello's dreams and death, 7.
- Steell's bust of Dr. Chalmers, 399.
- Stoddart, T. T. *See* Angling.
- Store system at mines a grievance, 70.
- Subscription of tests, and admission of Dissenters at Oxford, 49.
- Taylor, his work on "Popery, its character and crimes," 339.
- Tiberias, scenery around, tame but interesting from its associations, 121.
- Tremenhere, Mr., his Reports on the operation of the Mines and Collieries Act, 65.
- Trouts, their growth and habits, 303-311.
- Tutorial and Professorial systems of teaching at Universities, compared, 39.
- Tyler, J. Endell, B.D., his work on the worship of the Virgin in the Church of Rome, 339.

U

Union and Parochial rating and settlement compared, 375.

University Discipline at Oxford, 43—Reform, 21.

Ventilation in Mines, 72.

Vere, Mr. De, plan suggested by him for the relief of Ireland, 426.

Vicary, Rev. A., his Notes of a Residence at Rome in 1846, 348.

Vinet's Voluntaryism, 147.

W

Ward, Mr., his views in regard to the reverence due to the Virgin Mary, 351.

Whales in the Southern Ocean, 191.

"White Cat," the, beautifully illustrated by J. W., 387.

Wild cattle hunting in the Falkland Isles, account of, 209.

Wilkes, Lieut., his Antarctic Expedition, 187—his controversy with Sir J. C. Ross, 201.

Wilson, James, his notion of artificial flies, 315.

Wilson, John, D.D. *See* Lands of the Bible

